

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 29, 1991

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, May 29, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

During these days of remembrance of Memorial Day we recall with gratitude the names of those who have given their lives. O almighty and merciful God, whose love surrounds us at all the moments of life, we pray that the memory of those who have fallen will inspire each person to honor their memory with a renewed dedication to doing the things that make for justice and peace in our world. May the thought of their sacrifice encourage the peacemakers of our time to be diligent in the work of reconciliation so Your will may be done on Earth as it is in Heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE] to lead Members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Washington, DC, May 28, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 11:50 a.m. on Tuesday, May 28, 1991 the following message from the Secretary of the Senate: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 831, H.R. 971, and passed S. 3, S.J. Res. 150, S. Con. Res. 26, and S. Con. Res. 41.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. THOMAS J. KELLY

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly who passed away on April 27 at Georgetown University Hospital.

Admiral Kelly was a close personal friend and will be remembered by many in Congress for his distinguished military career that included service in World War II as commander of the cruiser *Springfield* in the Pacific.

After his retirement from distinguished service in the Navy, Admiral Kelly had a distinguished and very successful career as a private citizen. His contributions to this country are tremendous. He and his wife, Virginia, contributed so much to their country and to military service.

I include an article from the Washington Post to be printed in the RECORD.

THOMAS KELLY, NAVY ADMIRAL IN WWII, DIES

Thomas J. Kelly, 97, a retired Navy rear admiral who commanded the cruiser *Springfield* in the Pacific in World War II, died of pneumonia April 27 at Georgetown University Hospital.

Adm. Kelly, a resident of Washington, was born in Van Buren, Ark. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1920. He also studied mechanical engineering at the Naval Postgraduate School, and received a master's degree in petroleum engineering from the University of Pittsburgh.

A gunnery officer, Adm. Kelly served at various naval stations in the United States and on various ships prior to World War II. He also taught petroleum engineering at the Naval Academy. In the war, he took part in landing operations in the Philippines.

His postwar assignments included duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

and a period as head of the petroleum division of the National Security Resources Board. He also had a number of liaison missions to Turkey.

In 1948, Adm. Kelly retired from the Navy and settled in Washington. For the next 15 years he commuted to New York as assistant to the chairman of the Mobil Oil Corp. In the early 1960s, he became the Washington representative of Mercedes-Benz of North America. He retired 10 years later.

His personal military decorations included three awards of the Bronze Star with combat V.

Adm. Kelly was a member of the New York Yacht Club, the Metropolitan Club, the Cosmos Club, the Army & Navy Club, the 1925 F Street Club, and the King and Queen Rod and Gun Club.

Survivors include his wife, Virginia Weldon Kelly of Washington.

LET US WRAP UP THE IRAN-CONTRA INVESTIGATION

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court gave Lawrence Walsh a subtle message: Go home.

There is a time for everything under the Sun, and Walsh's time has come and gone. Iran-Contra is yesterday's news. Let us wrap it up, send all those lawyers back into productive jobs, and get this thing behind us.

We know nothing more about the affair than we did 4½ years ago, when the investigation started.

The biggest catch in this \$25 million fishing expedition has been the American taxpayer. He has been hooked, filleted, and fried. We cannot let this happen again.

Last year I introduced a bill which would automatically put a 2-year sunset provision on the appointment of independent counsels, unless an extension is approved.

Let us do the taxpayer a favor and make this bill a law.

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we will soon decide whether we were kidding the public when we passed the Americans With Disabilities Act, and when we passed legislation over past years to guarantee that women would be protected against discrimination, that members of racial and religious minorities would be also.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Elizabeth Dole, who held two Cabinet positions in the most recent set of administrations, argued very persuasively that women in this country face what she called the glass ceiling which prevents them from advancing if their talents would justify in their professions. We have legislation that will come to the floor that will give women, minorities, and the handicapped genuine protections in the form of the civil rights bill, and the administration is attempting a selling job. They are trying to tell people that legislation which says explicitly that quotas are banned will somehow become a quota bill.

How would that happen? Apparently because Supreme Court Justices the last two Presidents have appointed will take language which explicitly prohibits the quotas and transmogrify it into a license to have those quotas. The fact is that while we have made progress in getting rid of discrimination, more remains to be done. This bill will be the way to do it.

WELCOME TO THE PRESIDENT OF CYPRUS

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare and distinct pleasure to join with my colleagues in welcoming the President of Cyprus, his excellency George Vassiliou and Mrs. Vassiliou to our Nation's Capital. President Vassiliou is an outstanding leader who has worked tirelessly to resolve the seemingly intractable problems of Cyprus.

Although President George Vassiliou is a Greek Cypriot, he believes that ending the partition on Cyprus will benefit all Cypriots, Greek as well as Turkish.

We support your efforts, President Vassiliou, to end the conflict on Cyprus and Turkey can do its part by removing its 35,000 troops from Cyprus. That would be a positive step in the right direction and one that has consistently been called for by the United Nations.

We thank you, Mr. President, for your statesmanship as well as for your strong support during the recent gulf war.

THE REAGAN/BUSH LEGACY: THE MIDDLE CLASS SCRAMBLE

(Mr. HOAGLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, over the years, Americans have worked hard to provide a better life for their children. A basic part of the American outlook is that if you work hard, you can improve your lot. I am sure every American believes, as they well should, that working hard brings a better life.

After all, America is the land of opportunity. Americans want—and expect—a better life for our children.

It used to be that families could provide a good education and a better life with dad working 9 to 5 and mom staying home raising the kids. But today, both parents have to work to make ends meet. Since 1970, the number of working mothers with children under age 6 escalated by 27 percent. Today, more than 80 percent of women working are in their child-bearing years. Half the mothers with children under 1 year old work outside the home. And they work because they have to.

The last 10 years have taken a toll on American families. Average working Americans saw their income reduced 8.7 percent from 1979 to 1989, while the income of the wealthy jumped 12.3 percent. For young families starting out, income dropped by more than 13 percent. The income of the richest 1 percent of Americans grew by a whopping 113 percent while the income of America's poorest declined by more than 10 percent.

The tax picture is not much better. Since 1977, for moderate income families, Federal tax rates increased 2 percent, but for the top 1 percent of taxpayers, rates dropped 15 percent. In 1990, Federal, State, local, and Social Security taxes account for 25 percent of median family income; they were 14 percent in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, Reaganomics and supply-side economics have left us a legacy of a \$300 billion budget deficit, a \$2.6 trillion national debt, and \$198 billion in interest payments out of the taxpayer's pocket annually. The Reagan revolution passed by the American middle class, leaving it with lower wages, higher taxes, and more economic problems.

It is unconscionable to ask American families to pay for the spending excesses of the 1980's as they scramble to balance their own family budgets. Americans were willing to go to war to right a wrong; they were willing to pay for the war. But they expect fairness in our tax policies and the proper priorities in our spending. I call on my colleagues to join today in the effort to bring tax fairness to the American middle class.

LIPSERVICE WASHINGTON STYLE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard: "The check is in the mail," "I gave at the office." Now add to those, "The latest version is not a quota bill."

Unfortunately, the proponents of H.R. 1 continue to resort to political gimmickry to try to pass their bill.

As a small businessman let me tell you the most recent version of the civil

rights bill will continue to force small employers to hire by quotas to avoid expensive court battles over hiring and promoting decisions. Quota hiring will remain their only sure defense. Under new language added, employers will be sued even if it appears they are hiring by quotas. Your small business constituents are now guilty if they hire by the numbers and guilty if they do not hire by the numbers.

This new version is, frankly, only a last minute attempt to resurrect legislation whose grassroots support continues to fade.

The House plans to begin debate on H.R. 1 on Thursday. Join me in opposing final passage. There must be a better way to guarantee civil rights for everyone.

□ 1210

MFN FOR CHINA SHOULD END

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, we face the baffling and dismaying prospect that the second anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre will be commemorated by the President's request that we forget what the Chinese Government has done and simply extend its most-favored-nation trade status for another year.

They may want to play us for patsies on trade, but do we have to be accomplices to our own manipulation and shame? Surely not.

And so I pray that Congress will appropriately and decisively dismiss the President's request. We must stand firmly on behalf of the ideals and the interests we share with the great people of China: economic and political freedom and reform.

It is really hard to fathom how we could seriously consider action on China trade that so glibly ignores that Government's human rights record and so casually forfeits the influence we can bring to bear for reform. Does anyone believe we gain leverage with this regime by being kinder and gentler? A regime that callously represses its own people with executions and prison?

Why should Americans care?

First, the last 2 years have demonstrated how important it is for us to make common cause with reform movements around the world that promise ever more success in transforming closed societies into open ones.

Second, we must act unequivocally to show the Chinese Government that we do not tolerate its cynical policy of destabilizing the Third World with its sales of advanced weapons.

And, finally, we are not going to play the fool by acquiescing in China's blatant violation of law—in exploiting

prison labor to make export goods, or in pirating intellectual property covered by United States patents, trademarks, and copyrights. Resorting to tactics like that, it is no wonder they have built up a \$15 billion trade surplus with us.

I do not know who the President thinks he is kidding. Not this House. Here, let us hope, we have the gumption to do what is right and necessary. Pass the Solomon resolution to end MFN for China. Or, at least, pass the Pelosi resolution to attach clear, principled conditions on MFN renewal. Stand up. Stand tall. Stand strong.

IN SUPPORT OF THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN MEMORIAL FIRE SERVICE BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced along with 93 of our colleagues on Friday, once again the Benjamin Franklin Memorial Fire Service Bill of Rights.

This legislation will again be one of the top priorities of the 3 million men and women who make up the emergency response network in this country and has the unequivocal support of every major fire and emergency service group in America. It provides one-shot funding for scholarships of deceased firefighters, for their children and their loved ones. It provides college level training for advanced training in emergency response. It provides money for burn research. It provides money for public education programs, and it does all of this at no cost to the taxpayers by minting a special coin in 1993 in honor of America's first firefighter, Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this bill which has bipartisan support, passed the Senate in the last session of Congress, and we expect it to move very quickly in the House in this session.

IN SUPPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

(Mr. OWENS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have the Civil Rights Act of 1991 on the floor. This Civil Rights Act focuses on the workplace, on job rights. It is a bill for job rights for all Americans, just as H.R. 5, the antiscab legislation we will consider later, just as the Family and Medical Leave Act which we will consider later this year, all workers' rights bills.

In capitalism, the owner is king. The manager rules the show, but the workers have rights. The workers have a right not to be discriminated against. Disabled workers have a right not to be discriminated against. Women have a right not to be discriminated against. Minorities have a right not to be discriminated against.

This bill covers all three. This bill says to the owner, "You are King, but the people have rights." People have a right to a job. They have a right to survival. They have a right to conditions of work with dignity. This bill reinforces those rights. It is a bill for all Americans. As all civil rights bills in the past have been for all Americans, this bill is a bill which reinforces workers' rights.

PRESIDENT WOULD PROVIDE SMALL BUSINESS A BIGGER SHARE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARKET

(Mr. IRELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, America's 20 million small business owners generate some 60 percent of all new jobs in the United States. But far too few of them have ever tried to sell their products overseas.

In order to remain competitive in the world economy we must encourage small businesses to enter international markets.

There are over 30,000 U.S. small businesses with goods and services suitable for export who haven't even tried to market their products internationally. These missed opportunities are costly.

The Commerce Department is holding how-to-export seminars around the country specifically aimed at small and medium-sized firms.

These programs are so important that President Bush himself spoke at a conference in Boston last week.

Saying you are all for small business is easy. The President and the Department of Commerce are actually doing something to give our Nation's smaller firms a bigger share of the international market.

And that means more jobs for all Americans.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1, THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when he referred to our economy, the late President John F. Kennedy used to say, "A rising tide lifts all boats." Today we have an ebbing tide of unemployment, business failures,

foreclosures, and some people do not even have their boats in the water.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act, gives everyone the right to have their boat in the water. It is not a quota bill. The language of the law specifically says that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us to join together this week, pass H.R. 1, put everyone's boat in the water and then let us get to work creating jobs in America so there is a rising tide for everyone.

Please support H.R. 1.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT VASSILIOU OF CYPRUS

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to the United States the President of Cyprus, George Vassiliou.

President Vassiliou has worked tirelessly for years to bring the Cyprus issue to a successful resolution. Though Turkey continues its occupation of the island-nation, holding a third of its territory and forcibly separating the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities, positive signs are emerging.

I am encouraged to see that the Bush administration has stepped up its attempts to resolve this problem and I hope that today's meeting at the White House will continue this positive movement. I also hope that the U.S. Congress can and will be able to assist in this important work.

The wave of freedom that has swept through much of Eastern Europe waits to break over an occupied and divided Cyprus. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the tide is rising. Perhaps, even as the last stones of the Berlin Wall have been broken down and hauled away, the green line drawn across Cyprus soon will be washed away as well.

Again, I welcome President Vassiliou to Washington, wish him well at the White House today and applaud his great efforts on behalf of freedom to make whole again what has too long been divided.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR CONDITIONAL RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President again announced his support for unconditional renewal of most-favored-nation status for China. Instead of conditioning most-favored-nation status, he said he would impose new restrictions on missile and computer technology exports to China.

What my colleagues should understand, Mr. Speaker, is that these restrictions are not new. They are not new. They are required by law and they are long overdue.

The administration's China policy has been a failure. The President's attitude toward China has not succeeded in stopping China from transferring nuclear technology.

China still continues to export goods made from prison labor, making American workers compete with not only cheap labor, but free labor in a centralized economy.

China continues to violate our copyright laws and our intellectual property laws.

This year the trade deficit with China is expected to grow to \$15 billion because of the impediments to our products going into China.

It is time that we revisited this issue, Mr. Speaker. The tyrants in Beijing may think that it is inconceivable for the Chinese people to have freedom in their own country, but Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable.

Instead of aligning ourselves with the crumbling pillars of the past in China, we should associate ourselves with the future that we see in the eyes of the student demonstrators, many of them killed or imprisoned as a result of the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill for conditional renewal of MFN. I invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring it. I hope that they will be on board by June 1 when we observe the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre.

EMPORIA, KS, HONORS VETERANS IN MEMORIAL CEREMONIES

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report to you today that patriotism is alive and well in America's heartland.

I just returned from a weekend in my Kansas district where I was privileged to participate, along with Senator DOLE, in the dedication of the All Veterans' Memorial in Emporia.

The memorial honors veterans of all seven wars fought by the United States since Emporia was founded in 1857.

It also gives special recognition to Sgt. Grant Timmerman from Emporia. His family was awarded a Medal of Honor on his behalf for his bravery in World War II.

On hand for the dedication were recently returned veterans of the Persian Gulf war, two Kansans who received the Medal of Honor for their bravery in the Vietnam war, and thousands of spectators there out of appreciation to our veterans and love for our country.

This is another example of how the people of Emporia, such as Ken Bradstreet and those who helped him, are banding together to make sure we never forget the sacrifices made to keep America free.

□ 1220

PITTSBURGH: HOME TO WORLD CHAMPIONS

(Mr. COYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh became home to yet another world champion last Saturday when the Pittsburgh Penguins defeated the Minnesota North Stars 8 to 0 in game 6 of the Stanley Cup finals to capture their first Stanley Cup. The Penguins now join a long list of Pittsburgh sports champions. The Pittsburgh Pirates, being the second oldest franchise in baseball, have provided us with World Series championships and are currently the winningest team in baseball. The Pittsburgh Steelers' four Super Bowl wins is exceeded by no other team in professional football.

The Penguins' climb to the top was steady and relentless, and not without adversity. Several top stars, including Stanley Cup Most Valuable Player Mario Lemieux, were lost to the team for extensive periods of time during the season due to injury. The playoff series itself was a grueling test of 24 games played over a 52-day period against the strongest teams in the National Hockey League. The Penguins prevailed over the New Jersey Devils, the Washington Capitals, and the Boston Bruins before defeating the Minnesota North Stars in the Stanley Cup finals.

A Stanley Cup victory requires a total organizational effort. The Penguins were blessed with an ownership and a front office committed to winning, led by general manager Craig Patrick. A talented and experienced coaching staff led by Bob Johnson prepared the team for success. And, of course, a squad of 32 players, each of whom contributed in some way to the winning effort. Finally, a support staff of trainers and managers kept the team fit and healthy during a very demanding year that took in well over 100 games.

Yesterday, May 28, 80,000 Pittsburghers assembled at Point State Park in Pittsburgh for a noon rally to welcome their champions home. I add my congratulations to the entire Pittsburgh Penguin organization and the winning of the first of many Stanley Cups.

MEMBERS URGED TO VOTE AGAINST SSC FUNDING

(Mr. BOELHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOELHERT. Mr. Speaker, if you voted for the SSC in the past, how can you vote against it now? Here are just a few of the things that have changed since last year's vote:

Last year, DOE promised that the SSC would not cost Federal taxpayers more than \$5 billion. The Department now estimates total Federal spending on the SSC at \$5.6 billion—and that on the basis of a questionable total cost estimate and unrealistic assumptions about foreign contributions.

Last year, the House bill assumed the total cost of the project would be \$7.5 billion. Now, the official DOE estimate is \$8.2 billion. DOE recently admitted that the truer total cost to get the SSC ready to operate is \$9.1 billion. And an independent auditing group from inside DOE estimates the cost at \$11.8 billion. This on a project that Secretary Watkins once promised would not be built if it cost "one penny more" than \$5.9 billion—still above the original cost estimate.

Last year, DOE agreed that foreign contributions would cover 20 percent to 33 percent of the project's cost. To date, we have not a single penny from a foreign source, and we are paying Indian scientists to work in Texas.

Last year, DOE promised that the project would not hurt other science projects. This year, the SSC is already limiting funding for the other DOE-funded research, and DOE acknowledges that the SSC would eventually force the closing of at least two of the current accelerator facilities, which are Fermilab in Illinois, Brookhaven in New York, and SLAC in California.

HUMAN FACES: REAL PEOPLE WITH REAL PROBLEMS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today I will begin once a week introducing you to people you know. These are West Virginians, but each has the same problem that millions of Americans have: They do not have adequate access to health care. The glaring numbers scream "health care crisis" with each new report, but I believe it is time that the Congress begin seeing the human faces in front of the black-and-white statistics.

I would like you to meet Gideon, one of the cutest 2-year-old boys you will ever see. Gideon is stricken with cerebral palsy, requiring ongoing treatment. His father's employer was forced last year to change health insurers. Unfortunately, the new health insurer

ance does not cover preexisting illnesses. His parents simply cannot afford paying the out-of-pocket expenses for the occupational and physical therapy that Gideon needs.

Mr. Speaker, in the richest nation in the world, is it really possible that a working family cannot get the important therapy needed for their 2-year-old child?

Gideon and his parents would ask the President and the Congress to provide adequate access to health care. Until that happens, I will be introducing weekly the Gideons in our Nation who urge action.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, China guns down thousands of their own students. The President gives China a most-favored-nation trade status. Now, if that is not enough to boil your wonton soup, let us check something out.

The average Chinese worker makes 17 cents an hour, if he is not in jail. Now, if he is in jail, he gets a bowl of rice. Now, tell me, Mr. Speaker, how can a Chinese worker at 17 cents an hour buy Fords and Chevys from America? And how many kindlier and gentler American companies will now move to China for 17 cents-an-hour laborers?

Ladies and gentlemen, if China will shoot their own citizens, they will continue to rip us off to the tune of billions in trade and the American workers will keep standing in unemployment lines and qualifying for food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I say the American worker is telling us to "Beam us up, Scotty, there is no intelligent life left in Washington."

COTTAGE EDUCATION CORPORATION

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has talked about the concept of "a thousand points of light," a concept which embodies the idea that individual Americans take the initiative and serve their community, becoming a beacon of hope to those less fortunate. I want to tell you, I've discovered some awfully bright beacons in my central Florida congressional district.

Recently, I toured an organization called Cottage Education Corp. in the small town of Mount Dora, FL. While there, I spoke at length with the director of Cottage Education, Mr. Fred Baki.

He informed me how Cottage Education revolves around the concept of offering free tutoring to individuals who lack the financial resources to obtain an education. Volunteers come in 7 days a week to help migrant workers learn English, to teach reading skills to both children and adults and to offer a better and brighter future to many of the citizens of central Florida.

What makes Cottage Education Corp. unique is that it is primarily funded by the private sector. It is through the support of private individuals and companies which allows Cottage Education Corp. to flourish.

For example, in only 5 months since its inception, people actively seeking aid from Cottage Education has risen from 50 people in January to more than 200 this month. This is encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the efforts of Fred Baki and Cottage Education Corp. for heeding the President's call to become one of those "thousand points of light."

It is organizations like Cottage Education Corp. which best illustrate how a partnership between a nonprofit organization and the private sector can work together to create a ray of hope in a world which sometimes seems dark and lonely.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT GEORGE VASSILIOU OF CYPRUS

(Mr. HUGHES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the United States and a broad coalition of nations joined together to successfully repel Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. It is bitterly ironic for Greek Cypriots to watch the international community act so quickly to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait when so little has been done to remove the Turkish forces that have occupied and partitioned Cyprus for over 16 years.

It makes one wonder whether the New World Order is based upon principles of self-determination and national sovereignty, or is it based upon strategic importance or, perhaps other factors. The people of Cyprus deserve an answer, especially from this Congress which votes each year to supply Turkey with even more military aid.

We need to pay more attention to the tragic situation in Cyprus and actively assist in resolving the impasse.

Today we have the privilege of welcoming President George Vassiliou of Cyprus to Washington. I urge my colleagues to greet him warmly and at the same time seize this opportunity to learn more about the difficulties facing Cyprus and what we can do to reunite and return basic justice to the Cypriot people.

OPPOSE ABORTION LOBBY'S EFFORTS TO PROMOTE ABORTION AS A METHOD OF FAMILY PLANNING

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the slick abortionists at Planned Parenthood have reason to be concerned about the landmark Supreme Court decision handed down last week.

Planned Parenthood operates a fleet of abortion mills. Since 1980, Planned Parenthood affiliates have slaughtered over 1 million unborn babies in their clinics with chemical poison, knives, and suction dismemberment. They have also referred to a million more kids for destruction at other abortion mills.

Ironically, in 1963, Planned Parenthood itself published a pamphlet itself in which it said, "Abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun; but birth control merely postpones the beginning of life."

Sadly, Planned Parenthood now ignores that biological fact and promotes abortion as a method of family planning. The new regulations, upheld by the court, precludes that at title X clinics. Thankfully, the American public also finds that they are against abortion as a method of family planning.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, a March 1989 Boston Globe poll finds that 89 percent of the American public rejected abortion as a means of birth control, and a Gallup poll, organized in May 1990, found 88 percent disapproval.

The Supreme Court in essence has ruled that taxpayers are not required to subsidize abortion as a method of family planning.

A NEW CHANCE FOR ETHIOPIA

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Ethiopia has a new government today. For the time being at least, its 30-year civil war seems to be over.

The rebel group now in power in Addis Ababa say that they plan to turn the country over to a transition government in a month. They have said they will hold democratic elections in a year.

Democracy is long overdue in Ethiopia. But the absence of democracy hasn't been their only problem. More people have starved to death in Ethiopia than have been killed by the fighting. With the war over, Ethiopia may be able to break out of the cycle of drought and famine and death.

The first task of those in power will be to deal with the present famine that threatens the lives of 7 million people. The measurement of success for the government will be how well it deals with the crisis.

The select committee will be watching this situation closely. It would be a tragedy if a million Ethiopians starved before they get a chance to vote in next year's elections.

The shift in power in Ethiopia is only one of many significant changes that are taking place all over the developing world. This past weekend, I met with another new leader, President Aristide of Haiti. He said something about his own country, which I think applies to not only Ethiopia, but the entire Third World.

He said that Third World society is like a table. For many years a few people have been on top of the table, and most have been underneath. The goal of democracy is not revenge—it is not to put new people on top of the table. The goal of democracy is to put everyone around the table.

Ethiopia's moves toward democracy are good. But the new government should demonstrate its commitments to democracy by seating everyone at the table, and putting a stop to the politics of famine. There has been enough dying in Ethiopia. The Ethiopian people finally deserve a chance to live free from war, and free from want.

IRAN-CONTRA INVESTIGATION MAY END, HALT POLITICAL VEN- DETTA

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has decided to let sit a decision that will hopefully end the Iran-Contra carnival and free Oliver North and other patriotic victims of a political vendetta.

Lawrence Walsh, special prosecutor in the Iran-Contra investigation, has been spending money like a Rajah from days gone by. Housed in splendor, he and his staff have lacked none of the amenities that they and TV evangelists have become accustomed to. Walsh has spent an incredible \$25 million in the past 54 months.

All of this time, effort, and incredible expense has been aimed at little more than extracting a pound of flesh from Ollie North and others whose crime was trying to stop Communist expansion in Central America.

This circus should be closed, the expensive clowns should take off their makeup and get out of town. Larry Walsh should not have wasted so much time and so much money.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT GEORGE VASSILIOU OF CYPRUS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join my colleagues this afternoon in welcoming President George Vassiliou of Cyprus.

For those of us who follow events in the Eastern Mediterranean, President Vassiliou's visit to Washington comes at a very opportune moment. In the wake of the international coalition's victory over Iraq, the age-old conflicts in this region have become the subject of renewed diplomatic attention.

There is strong sense of optimism that the conditions are ripe for a breakthrough on Cyprus. We have long felt that the long-standing problems on Cyprus could yield to a solution if we can focus the attention and energy of the key players in the region.

In general terms, the end of the cold war and the reinvigoration of the United Nations that we saw during the gulf crisis are factors that help massage the overall atmosphere for peacemaking. In addition, we have strong indications from Secretary General Perez de Cuellar that he would like to see a solution to the Cyprus problem before he completes his term at the end of the year.

In Turkey, the leadership of President Ozal and his assistance during the gulf crisis has taken the United States and Turkey to a new level of bilateral cooperation. The same can be said of Greece and the efforts of Prime Minister Mitsotakis. Since coming to office, Prime Minister Mitsotakis has taken several steps to put United States-Greek relations on a steady course. The cooperation we received from both countries during the gulf crisis should lay to rest the fear that NATO's southeastern flank was coming unglued.

But today we have with us one person who—more than any other—has given us cause for optimism. President Vassiliou has dedicated himself to finding a solution that addresses the problems of all Cypriots—the Greeks and the Turks. Around the world, intractable regional conflicts remain intractable when leaders are unwilling or unable to take risks for peace. President Vassiliou has shown that he is willing and determined to take the steps necessary to reach out to the other side. He remains committed to a peaceful settlement that guarantees a unified, federal republic, with respect for the human rights of all the Cypriot people.

Mr. President, it is our pleasure to welcome you back to Washington. We wish you a successful visit and we offer our strong support for your ongoing effort to bring peace and justice to Cyprus.

THE NEXT GIANT STEP FOR MAN IS THE SPACE STATION FREEDOM

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest triumphs of this century—indeed, of all human history—was the Apollo Program which brought American astronauts to the surface of the Moon. I would guess that every Member of this institution remembers precisely where they were when Neil Armstrong declared that he was taking a small step for man, but a giant step for mankind.

Today we are poised to take the next giant step for man in space. That step is represented by the space station Freedom. During the next 10 days, this body will make a fundamental decision on whether the United States and its international partners continue with—or cancel—the space station.

Some say the space station is too expensive. Others say it will come at the expense of other science and space programs. Indeed, some say it is unnecessary.

These same criticisms were levelled at Apollo, but the U.S. Congress had the wisdom to stay the course—to provide the necessary appropriations so that Apollo would go down as a pivotal landmark in human history.

When the time comes for us to cast our votes on the space station, I urge my colleagues to vote for making history—for continuing in the tradition of the Apollo Program. To do otherwise would be to withdraw from the greatness which technology and a robust space program will provide.

NATO MAKING DRAMATIC AND LONG OVERDUE CHANGES

(Mr. RAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Rotterdam where my colleagues and I visited a meeting of the North Atlantic Alliance—NATO's parliament.

NATO is in the midst of making dramatic changes. NATO defense ministers meeting in Brussels are crafting the final touches on sweeping military reforms intended to reflect the changes which have occurred in the post-cold-war era.

The thrust of the strategic changes being considered right now centers around a concept known as the rapid reaction force. The rapid reaction force will include a multinational corps of about 60,000-70,000 troops and an air contingent. It would be sufficiently mobile to react to crises anywhere in Europe. The current policy of deploying single-nation corps stretched north to south across Europe would be termi-

nated. The multinational rapid reaction corps [RRC] would include a heavy British division and the corps commander would be British.

The ground units would be supplied by European nations. The United States would provide a significant portion of the air assets, and the Germans would occupy a prominent leadership role, possibly commanding the air contingent.

In the broader context, larger reinforcement forces would continue to be maintained in addition to the rapid reaction force, including a U.S. ground force consisting of a robust corps. Total U.S. deployments would be reduced from two corps and seven air wings to about one corps and three air wings.

The United States would maintain a naval commitment of one carrier battle group and a marine force in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Speaker, these changes are long overdue at NATO, and I am encouraged by this action. I look forward to watching these agreements go forward.

The Washington Post article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1991]

NATO SETS NEW STANCE FOR NEW ERA

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

BRUSSELS, May 28.—NATO defense ministers meeting here today approved a sweeping military restructuring of the Western alliance aimed at adapting it to the post-Cold War era, senior allied officials said.

The revision would enact what the officials have described as the broadest strategic and conceptual changes in the 42-year history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, while shifting its focus from the threat of a massive Soviet conventional offensive to potential attacks by lesser powers and future conflicts sparked by European regional or ethnic tensions.

The reorganization is intended to accommodate a new military balance in Europe, shaped partly by the expected cutback over the next three years of up to 350,000 U.S., British, German, Belgian and Dutch troops now deployed in NATO units, British Defense Minister Tom King told reporters here. He described this as about one-fifth of the number of troops these nations now commit to NATO.

Explaining what he characterized as NATO's diminished fear of Soviet attack, King said the ministers noted at their meeting that roughly a half-million East European troops are no longer under Soviet control and that another 500,000 Soviet troops were being withdrawn from East European territory. The new NATO concept, he said, is an "effective and sensible response to the new security situation" in Europe in that it provides for "smaller . . . highly capable" forces still capable of defending against any possible Soviet threat. NATO heads of state are expected to give final approval to the changes at a meeting tentatively scheduled for November.

Under the new system, NATO would establish for the first time several multinational, division-sized units of perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 troops, a long-contemplated action given impetus by the success of the joint operation against Iraq that involved a number of NATO members, officials said. But at the heart of NATO's new look is expansion of its

existing crisis-reaction force from fewer than 5,000 troops to more than 50,000.

Officials said the rapid-deployment force, using light equipment and fast transport, is intended to form the initial wedge of any future NATO military intervention within the territory of member states, stretching from Norway to Turkey. The allies have been unable to agree on whether the force could intervene in disputes occurring outside NATO territory, officials said.

Although some alliance members earlier had espoused staffing the force solely with European troops, Secretary of Defense Richard B. Cheney told other ministers today that Washington wants to contribute both ground and air forces to it, a senior U.S. official said. He added that Cheney encountered no resistance to the suggestion.

Other officials said that under the new formula, the rapid-reaction force is to be supplemented by a "base force" of up to five slower-moving but more powerful mobilized corps amounting to as many as 500,000 additional troops. NATO now fields a total of eight corps largely dedicated to stopping a Soviet advance through German territory.

The United States has pledged to contribute one Army corps to this revamped NATO force instead of the two currently stationed in Europe, senior U.S. officials said. This move is expected to reduce the present U.S. troop deployment of 300,000 by at least 50 percent.

In the event of a major military threat or long-term security crisis, further support would eventually be provided by what NATO planners are calling an "augmentation" force probably composed solely of U.S. units. Under the new concept, first units of the rapid-reaction force might intervene within days, the base force within weeks and the augmentation force within months, a senior U.S. defense official said. However, neither he nor other officials here offered a concrete scenario for future NATO involvement in a conflict within the European territory of member states.

"The security in Europe has much improved, although risks and uncertainties remain," a group of 13 European defense ministers said in a statement on the principles that underlie NATO's continuing post-Cold War strategy review. "The Soviet Union is undergoing a delicate process of internal reform, but it retains substantial residual forces. There is, moreover, the potential for crises in Central and Eastern Europe, which could jeopardize stability," the statement said.

The new rapid-response force is to be led by British officers, and the British Army of the Rhine now stationed in Germany is to provide two of the new command's four or five divisions, officials said. Several diplomats said the British government had pressed for NATO endorsement of the idea ahead of other revisions in the alliance in hopes of fending off domestic pressure to cut its force levels in Europe.

Officials cited as another justification the example of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, which prompted the alliance to send 42 NATO warplanes hurriedly to Turkish military bases north of the Iraqi border.

The French government, which had proposed creating a rapid-response force under control of the 12-nation European Community, released a statement in Paris today saying that NATO's action "does not concern us," because French forces are not committed to the alliance's military command.

A French Foreign Ministry spokesman said also the government feels it is premature to

discuss formation of a separate rapid-reaction force involving French troops that would be independent of NATO control. French officials have lobbied for the idea with other NATO members, and they raised it Monday during talks with Secretary of Defense Richard B. Cheney in Paris.

Cheney made clear that Washington opposes placing any NATO forces under separate control, and other alliance ministers said they agreed that the potentially divisive issue should not be pursued at this time.

TIME TO SAY NO TO FURTHER FUNDING FOR THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, today I will be joining with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART], and the chairman of the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the ranking minority member on that subcommittee in a bipartisan effort to terminate further funding for the superconducting super collider, and I urge my colleagues, as they make their decision on this very important financial question to consider one basic fact.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues will recall, in 1987 the cost of this project was estimated to be \$5.6 billion. Earlier this year the Department of Energy estimated that the cost had risen to \$8.25 billion, and several weeks ago the cost went up again to \$9.1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have not even broken ground the cost has nearly doubled, and now is the time to say no, and I urge my colleagues to take a hard look at this project and support us this afternoon.

In addition to that, I would point out also that several years ago, when a number of us supported this project, we were projecting a deficit of less than \$100 billion this year, and now the deficit is going to be about three times that much.

□ 1240

AMENDMENT WOULD DELETE FUNDING FOR SSC

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, today the House will debate the energy and water appropriations bill. I, together with my colleagues Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. SHAYS, will be joining my Science Committee colleagues, Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. ECKART, in offering an amendment to delete funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC].

Should it be built, the SSC would be the largest and most expensive piece of scientific equipment ever assembled. Unfortunately, our budget situation does not provide us the luxury of undertaking such gigantic endeavors with continually escalating costs—particularly given the serious questions that have arisen with respect to the management of this project.

We have watched the costs of the SSC rise dramatically from \$5 billion in 1983 to over \$8 billion today. While supporters have expressed assurances that foreign contributions would pay at least 20 percent of the total cost, the Department of Energy has secured just one \$50 million pledge from a foreign country.

Should these contributions fail to materialize, it will be the U.S. taxpayer who picks up the tab.

There are many who contend that SSC actually stands for "steadily skyrocketing costs" and the history of the project appears to support such a title.

Unfortunately, given our budget constraints, now is not the time to attempt a project of potentially astronomical costs. The time to terminate the SSC is now.

THE SSC, IS BIGGER BETTER?

(Mr. ECKART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, last year summer's hit movie was Tom Hanks and it was entitled "Big." That is where a child made a wish at night and woke up in the morning with an adult body. Indeed, in some circumstances bigger is better. But there is another saying that goes like this: "The bigger they are, the harder they fall."

That is how we find ourselves with big government's latest effort at buying science, the superconducting supercollider. From \$5.6 billion just 4 years ago to \$9.1 billion 2 weeks, 2 weeks after the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Appropriations Committee marked up their bill, this project, like Tom Hanks, has grown up with a big adult body, but it has a small child's mind.

Big results do not always give you a big deal. Let us not be part of a big waste. SHERRY BOEHLERT, CHRIS SHAYS, HOWARD WOLPE, JIM SLATTERY, and myself will offer a bipartisan amendment to end this big waste of big government money.

Let us not make another big mistake. End the superconducting super collider before it bankrupts us in a really big way.

BRING HOME THE RESERVES AND NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President of the United States to bring home the Reserves and the National Guard and to do it now, not next week, not next month, but now. They were taken from their jobs and their families to do a job, and they did it exceedingly well. Now bring them home.

There is no rhyme or reason for them to continue to remain in the Persian Gulf. Their wives and their children need them more than do the Kuwaitis. There are families who are on public assistance, and if one does not think they are, come to Steubenville and I will show my colleagues some. These people are fraught with emotion, stress, and fear. They come into my office crying because they do not have their loved ones there and they have no way of financial and moral support.

The President can reward them by reconciling them with their families. They are needed at home, not in the Persian Gulf. Bring them back, Mr. President. Bring them back now.

WELCOME TO CYPRUS' PRESIDENT GEORGE VASSILIOU

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in welcoming to the United States George Vassiliou, President of Cyprus. President Vassiliou is here to meet with President Bush and Congress to discuss the Cyprus issue and review bilateral relations. As my colleagues know, since his election in 1988, President Vassiliou has worked tirelessly to build international support for the reunification of Cyprus. During his fourth visit to the United States, I am hopeful President Vassiliou will receive the assurance of United States support for his plan to end the division of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, since Turkish troops illegally invaded Cyprus in July 1974. Since then this island has been the setting for one of the world's most intractable international conflicts. Today, 35,000 Turkish troops occupy northern Cyprus and 200,000 Greek Cypriots are refugees in their own land.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 years, we have witnessed great changes occur throughout the world. The cold war has ended, and international problems which once seemed intractable have been solved. Just this weekend, the Bush administration helped negotiate safe passage to Israel for thousands of Ethiopian Jews whose chances for freedom seemed dim just months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore think President Vassiliou's visit presents President Bush with an exciting opportunity to build on this diplomatic success. The question of how the Cyprus issue should be resolved is complicated because both Greece and Turkey are NATO allies. The United States however, cannot ignore the situation in Cyprus because it is a sensitive one. Instead, we must use our strong relationship with both Greece and Turkey to help promote a lasting settlement of this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, President Vassiliou deserves commendation for his work to bring about a solution to the division of Cyprus. During his tenure as President, he has demonstrated his willingness to compromise with the United Nations Secretary General. However, to achieve a peace, both sides must come to the bargaining table. Unfortunately, Rauf Denktash, the leader of the Turkish population of Cyprus, and Turkish President Turgut Ozal have refused in any meaningful way to participate in the Secretary General's efforts toward peace. Talks can only resume if Turkey agrees to make some concessions to achieve a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, the time is right for the United States to express our interest in bringing about a solution to this crisis. I urge President Bush to use Mr. Vassiliou's visit to express his support for U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar's call for the removal of Turkey's 35,000 troops and 80,000 settlers from Cyprus.

LET US END FAILED CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT POLICY TOWARD CHINA

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the extension of most-favored-nation trade status for the People's Republic of China. If the Chinese are going to take a hard line on human rights and nuclear weapons, then the United States should take a hard line of China.

The President says that they were good to us in the United Nations during the Persian Gulf conflict. Well, if my colleagues consider being good taking a walk, abstaining time after time when a critical vote was coming up and, therefore, we have to reward them, then I think there is a misguided set of responsibilities and obligations which this administration has.

A policy of constructive engagement failed miserably when the Reagan administration applied it to South Africa during the 1980's. I think 2 years after the Tiananmen Square massacre, after years of disregarding the nuclear proliferation concern of the United States and the world, I think that what right now we have to do is recognize that the

Chinese have engaged in a morally destructive policy of disengagement.

MILITARY RULE IN CYPRUS TERMED ILLEGITIMATE

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, around the world military rule is being challenged and the prevailing winds of democracy are taking hold. But in Cyprus, 35,000 Turkish troops remain as the single obstacle to peace.

Whether in Northern Ireland or northern Cyprus, military rule is illegitimate rule. Anywhere it exists military occupation has only bred hatred and mistrust, instead of peace, prosperity, and security.

Today we are honored by the visit of President Vassiliou of Cyprus. His commitment to peace has significantly influenced events in Cyprus, and his dedication to his people serves as a model to us all.

The international community has attempted to facilitate a settlement, and President Vassiliou has walked a long way to extend the olive branch. But Mr. Denktash refuses to bridge the green line.

He has instead remained wedded to Turkish strong-arming instead of Cypriot democracy.

The Bush administration is in a position to leverage a settlement, but as we've seen time and time again, they have instead chosen political advantage over moral principle.

The United States has rewarded Turkish repression with annual increases in foreign aid, instead of conditioning the aid on withdrawal. It is the same old double standard consistently used for Turkey. It is time to reverse that trend and leverage Turkey's hand.

After all, it is a small price to pay for peace.

DENY MFN STATUS FOR CHINA

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the new world order is strangely like the old world order. The United States and the President spoke this weekend about giving most-favored-nation status to China. We should have learned our lesson with Iraq. Ignoring Iraq's harboring of terrorist groups, ignoring their murdering of 5,000 Kurds, ignoring virtually every brutal and despicable act of Saddam Hussein, the administration, until August 2, refused to speak out against the outrages that Iraq perpetrated against its own people and peoples around the world.

We find the same inconsistency in the administration's attitude toward

granting MFN to the butchers of Tiananmen Square. The administration refused to speak out strongly at the very beginning of the Chinese oppression of the Chinese students in Tiananmen Square, and to this date the administration has not taken any serious acts in response to that murder.

Mr. President, we need to send the Chinese a very clear signal, that MFN is not something granted for political expediency. When we think political expediency, we damage our own agenda, as we did in the Middle East in trying that expedient policy toward Saddam Hussein.

Let us stick to America's values. Let us not grant MFN to the Chinese.

□ 1250

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NAGLE). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestations of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JAKE GARN OF UTAH

(Mr. OWENS of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak a word of welcome to President Vassiliou of Cyprus. I will do so, but first I would like to express a word of tribute to my colleague, JAKE GARN of Utah, who just a few moments ago in Salt Lake City announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection next year.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not often that a person whose congressional career was cut short by what was thought to be his political nemesis rises to his tribute. But JAKE GARN beat me 16 years ago in a contest for the Senate, and it took me 12 years to get back. I expected when I came back that the toughest job I would have was getting along with him, and it has turned out to be one of the most pleasant and most rewarding. We have become close personal friends, as well as coworkers, with genuine bipartisanship in the Congress on behalf of Utah.

JAKE GARN has been a national leader. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he did as much or more than almost anyone in the Congress to try to alert the country to the coming savings and loan crisis, and to try to be reparative of it. In the space effort he has been a national leader. His work on the Appropriations Committee has been immensely beneficial, in a very quiet way, for the

State of Utah. Together we have put together, with the rest of the delegation, a genuinely monumental piece of legislation in the completion of the central Utah project.

JAKE GARN possesses absolute integrity. His word is his bond, and no one in Congress has worked harder to establish that reputation and is more deserving of that tribute.

Marlene and I have joined in sending affectionate best wishes to JAKE and Kathleen Garn as they prepare to leave the Senate, and join in tribute to him and to the competence and accomplishments that he has brought to the Congress.

WELCOME PRESIDENT VASSILIOU OF CYPRUS

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with many others in Congress and around the country to extend a warm welcome to President Vassiliou of Cyprus.

Since 1964, dozens of resolutions have been adopted by the U.S. Security Council condemning the continuing occupation of northern Cyprus by Turkish forces. To waver in our opposition to the division of the island and the presence of foreign troops, to placate Turkey at all costs, is to be selective in our adherence to international law. It is shortsighted. It is inconsistent. And it is wrong. Last week, the Foreign Affairs Committee upheld the longstanding 7 to 10 military aid ratio between Turkey and Greece as a signal that the solution to the problem of a divided Cyprus still lays in Ankara.

Turkey should be commended, Mr. Speaker, and helped, for its invaluable assistance in the gulf war. However, we must recognize the injustice of rewarding Turkey at all costs. Cyprus strongly supported all U.N. resolutions on Iraq. It served as a key communications and transfer center for the allies. Turkey did a lot more, that is true, but Turkish occupation of Cyprus is illegal and contrary to international law, and we must not lose our perspective on that.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2427, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 160

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 11, through page 16, line 19; beginning on page 17, lines 1 through 7; beginning on page 18, line 14, through page 21, line 21; beginning on page 22, line 9, through page 27, line 4; beginning on page 28, lines 14 through 25; beginning on page 33, line 5, through page 46, line 15; beginning on page 46, line 18 through page

47, line 11; beginning on page 48, line 1 through page 51, line 23; beginning on page 53, lines 11 through 24; and beginning on page 54, lines 5 through 18. It shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Yates of Illinois or his designee, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the rule waiving certain points of order against certain provisions of the bill, H.R. 2427, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1992.

General appropriations bills are privileged in the House. General debate is customarily limited pursuant to a unanimous-consent agreement reached prior to floor consideration.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against specified provisions of H.R. 2427. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriations in general appropriations bills. The provisions receiving these waivers are designated in the rule by reference to page and line in the bill.

The resolution also makes in order an amendment offered by Representative YATES or his designee. The amendment is printed in the report accompanying the resolution. All points of order against the amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

H.R. 2427 provides appropriations for a number of activities, including those conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, as well as those conducted by several independent agencies, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

H.R. 2427 also provides \$434 million for the superconducting super collider, which will be the world's most powerful particle accelerator and the largest scientific instrument ever built.

The SSC represents an unparalleled opportunity for the United States to lead the way in advancing mankind's knowledge of matter and energy at its most fundamental level. Our Nation has always been at the forefront of scientific discovery, and the SSC offers the prospect of continued leadership in this area.

Of course, while it's difficult to predict now where the SSC will lead us, we do know that past scientific and technological breakthroughs have had enormous impact on our daily lives. Major advances in medicine, agriculture, computers, and lasers have come about because of our Nation's commitment to basic scientific research. It's reasonable to believe that the SSC will also lead to now unforeseen discoveries that will profoundly affect the way we live.

The SSC also represents a golden opportunity to help ensure that America remains on the cutting edge of scientific research. It means that America will lead the way in discovering new technologies and developing innovative solutions to the problems confronting modern societies.

It promises to pay tremendous dividends in another way, by encouraging our Nation's youth to pursue educational opportunities in science and engineering.

Much has been said about how other countries, particularly the Japanese, are graduating many more scientists and engineers than we are, and about the serious implications this presents for our future economic growth and international competitiveness.

Clearly, the decline in enrollment in these programs must be reversed. The SSC is one way in which we can stimulate renewed interest in science and engineering programs.

Universities from over 30 States will be involved with the SSC. Significant amounts of SSC money will be devoted to research conducted by American universities at the SSC site and at their own campuses. This effort will strengthen the research capabilities at these and other institutions throughout the country.

We all recognize that we have to be more selective in how we spend our money, and make better use of the limited resources available to us. I submit, however, that the SSC is precisely the type of project which is most deserving of our support. It is a project with not only near-term benefits, but one that provides an opportunity to reap benefits for many years to come. This is an opportunity that we should not let pass us by.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 facilitates consideration of the SSC and the other programs funded by H.R. 2427. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may begin consideration of this important bill.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the proposed rule under which the House would consider H.R. 2427, making appropriations for energy and water development through fiscal year 1992. I do so with some reservations.

Many on this side of the aisle believe fervently in proceeding under the rules

of the House in such a way as to maximize debate on behalf of Americans. Therefore we have justifiable concerns about the number of waivers grant for all kinds of bills to exempt them from House rules and points of order. That is, perhaps, especially true for appropriations bills.

And such is the case with this rule. It grants waivers for clauses 2 and 6 of House rule XXI—in order to allow certain unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions on an appropriations bill, and to allow reappropriations.

While this side generally opposes such procedures, we must nonetheless recognize the overriding importance of this appropriations bill.

To prove that point, I submit, we should heed the words of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee chairman, Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi, who made two especially salient points on these procedural matters in his letter to the Rules Committee:

First, with respect to the unauthorized appropriations in the bill, Chairman, WHITTEN indicates that the committees of jurisdiction have been contacted and voiced no objections; and

Second, the legislative provisions in the bill are necessary to permit timely action on, and efficient execution of, ongoing public works programs of both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

All that said, I return to my earlier point. That, given the legislative and political circumstances under which the House operates, this rule represents the best available option. And the many vital programs to be funded under this appropriation—ranging from nuclear weapons programs to flood control—those programs should not be held hostage in hopes that the broken legislative machinery of the House will suddenly and miraculously be repaired. Rather, we should accept the rule, and accept the reality that our legislative process is not operating smoothly, that it needs attention, it needs reform, it needs streamlining. The process just does not work. We are forced to consider appropriations before authorizations out of concern for timely funding and efficiency. It should not, and need not, be like this. The majority has the responsibility to permit meaningful reforms to take place to fix this broken process.

So I support the rule, with reservations.

I should also hasten to add that I have no reservations whatsoever about the good and hard work done by the appropriations subcommittee on energy and water development. Chairman BEVILL of Alabama and the ranking member, Mr. MYERS of Indiana deserve special commendation for dealing with this challenging task. Working under the tight restrictions presented by last year's budget agreement, they have

produced a bill that will appropriate \$21.5 billion—about \$115 million below the President's request. While many Members may have wished for greater funding in one program or another, we should commend the subcommittee for their hard work.

For instance, the subcommittee received testimony from more than 100 Members of Congress in the hearings that led to this final bill. And it is noteworthy that in terms of domestic discretionary programs in this bill there is no real dollar increase over fiscal year 1991. The American people should be so fortunate that every spending bill was equally disciplined.

Because of such constraints, the subcommittee made some very tough choices. That should be recognized and applauded by each and every Member of this House.

So I would close, Mr. Speaker, by thanking the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for their effort, express my support for the statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] in support of the rule, and encouraging my colleagues to adopt this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is the subject of this rule appropriates \$1.4 billion for general sciences and research activities. However, of this, over \$434 million is earmarked for the superconducting super collider [SSC], a single project which is well on its way to becoming a gigantic financial black hole. In future years it will drain billions of dollars, threaten existing science projects and activities, eliminate any prospect for new science initiatives, and erode the financial base available for other deserving programs in the entire domestic budget area. There are many of us in this body who contend that SSC actually stands for "steadily skyrocketing costs", and the history of the cost projections for this project support such a title. Since the inception of this project in 1983, we have watched as DOE's own cost estimates have risen from \$5 billion to \$5.3 billion to \$5.9 billion to \$7.8 billion to a figure of \$8.2 billion today. And an independent cost estimate completed by the Department's own independent cost estimating team predicts that the cost will be as high as \$11.8 billion.

Every time the cost went up, the Department of Energy was here assuring us that it finally had the numbers right, and the latest estimate was the last, and accurate number. In fact, just last year the Department supported the authorizing legislation approved overwhelmingly by 309 Members of this

body that set a \$5 billion cap on Federal expenditures for this project. Today, less than a year after such assurances, the representatives of DOE tell us the department can no longer support such a cap.

Now, to hide the true cost of this project, the DOE insists that \$2.6 billion of the \$8.2 billion estimate will come from non-Federal sources. Therefore, according to the DOE, the Federal cost is a mere \$5.649 billion—only slightly more than original cost estimates. As my colleagues and I will detail later, there are several inaccuracies in that type of wishful accounting. The Department left out of its estimate over \$800 million in costs that it admits exist. For a variety of reasons, DOE has excluded them from the total project cost estimate. However, just because DOE does not define them as project costs does not mean the taxpayers will not pay them. Nor does it mean that the burden these costs will place on competing programs will be any less. Those expenses will come from the Federal treasury and will reduce the amount of funds available to other programs. Moreover, the Department's representation that \$1.7 billion in costs will be offset by foreign contributions is both unrealistic and disingenuous. To date the Department has secured only one \$50 million pledge, and it refuses to rule out asking Congress to make up the shortfall.

In other words, the \$434 million we are being asked to approve this year only represents another installment toward a financial hemorrhage that will last until the end of the century, consuming a good portion of the funds available for general science and research, and likely threatening ongoing programs. It is more than coincidence that our esteemed colleague from Illinois will have to offer an amendment today to restore funding for improvement activities at Fermi Lab. However, if my friend is successful, and I hope that he will be, we will only be previewing an annual struggle that will continue and increase in intensity as long as the SSC is competing for funds. Fermi may get a reprieve this year, but what about next year when the SSC needs \$638 million, and likely even more when foreign contributions don't materialize? The funds needed to keep alive existing accelerations labs like Fermi, Brookhaven and Stanford will simply not be available if we have to feed the voracious appetite of the SSC. The estimated operating costs for the SSC, in 1992 dollars, is \$380 million. That represents 74 percent of the existing budget for all of the accelerator labs. Something will have to give, and it is unlikely to be the SSC if we have spent billions on its construction. Already, DOE has told us that some existing accelerators will be closed when the SSC opens.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the funding for this program is not as difficult a choice as some may want us to believe. Cutting out \$434 million this year saves \$638 million DOE already plans to ask for in fiscal year 1993. And it only goes up from there. Between fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1999, the DOE's own funding plans call for appropriations of \$3.9 billion. Along the way, it is very clear that we will also have to start making up for some or all of the \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions that don't materialize.

To prevent this hemorrhaging, and to save funding for other deserving science activities, I strongly urge my colleagues to cut the funds for this project. Failure to do so will give the Department of Energy a blank check.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, and will do so again during the debate on the bill, to support the bipartisan amendment that will be offered by Mr. SLATTERY to halt this project before any more money is wasted.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I must rise to oppose this rule. This rule, which appears innocuous enough, is actually a gag order, limiting debate on the superconducting super collider [SSC]. Yet it seems to me that the collider, merely the single most expensive scientific instrument in human history, is worthy of some extended debate.

We sought a waiver from the Rules Committee to enable the House to debate an amendment that would have limited the Federal cost of the collider to \$5 billion. There's nothing new about that. The House passed such a spending cap last year, and the Department of Energy [DOE] promised to abide by it. Now, that appears to be just one more of the Department's broken promises. I should add that the cap was set, not by skeptics like me, but by the collider's most ardent proponents. What a difference a year makes.

But, you say, "You needed a waiver of the rules. How can you complain of unfair treatment?" The waiver we sought is precisely the same waiver the Appropriations Committee received to be able to bring this bill to the floor in the first place. The waiver we sought is precisely the same waiver Chairman YATES received to try to get more money for Fermilab. To limit funding for the SSC, we sought precisely the same waiver the Appropriation Committee received to permit spending on the SSC. And we sought that waiver after getting a green light from both the chairman and the ranking member of the authorizing committee of jurisdiction. I dare say there may never have been a stronger argument for a waiver.

But the supporters of the SSC do not desire open debate on this issue. They do not want the House to be able to impose a spending cap on a bill that the other body will actually have to consider. They don't want to have to explain how promises DOE made at this time last year have proved as ephemeral as a single quark.

Anyone who believes that an \$8.2 billion project should be subject to more than cursory debate, anyone who believes that such a project should be subject to more direct attention than is provided simply by cutting the bottom line of a spending bill, anyone who believes a handful of Members of the House should not be able to squelch debate, anyone who believes the House should not be hamstrung by the unwillingness of the Senate to take up authorization bills—anyone who feels this way should vote to defeat the rule.

Scientists are always lecturing us about how they need to have free and open discussion to carry on their pursuit of truth. We need a similarly free and open discussion if we are to fund their work.

□ 1310

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume so that I may insert the President's statement on this bill at this point in the RECORD. The statement of administration policy is as follows:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1991.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
(H.R. 2427—Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, FY 1992—Sponsors: Whitten, Mississippi; Beville, Alabama)

This Statement of Administration Policy expresses the Administration's views on H.R. 2427, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee. On the basis of CFO's preliminary scoring of the bill, the Committee recommendations are within the House 602(b) allocation. In aggregate, the House 602(b) allocations are consistent with the statutory spending limits enacted in the Budget Enforcement Act. However, the Committee's bill shifts domestic resources from critical research and development efforts to various water projects of less national significance.

The Administration's major funding objections are that the bill cuts \$100 million from the President's request for the Superconducting super collider and \$43.5 million from the new Fermilab Main Injector for high energy physics research. The reduction in funding for the Superconducting Super Collider would extend the ten-year design and construction schedule and increase total project costs. This action might also undermine prospects for obtaining international participation in the project. The President's budget assumes that such participation would offset one-third of the total project cost. Reduced funding for the Fermilab Injector would postpone acquisition of the new Main Injector ring for at least one year. Funding at requested levels for these crucial investments in the nation's science infrastructure is needed to ensure America's competitive position in research

and development. The Administration strongly opposes an amendment to be offered by Representative Slattery that would eliminate all funding for the Superconducting Super Collider.

Instead of providing funding at the required levels for these crucial investments in research and development, the Committee has provided \$115 million more than the President's request to the Army Corps of Engineers. In addition, the Committee has inflated savings and project slippage, and has substituted various low-priority water projects for the Administration's proposed high-priority new construction and major rehabilitation projects. Most of the projects substituted by the Committee are uneconomical, do not meet cost-sharing requirements, or are not Federal responsibilities. Similar objections apply to several Bureau of Reclamation projects.

The Administration strongly opposes section 502, which would bar the use of funds appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for the implementation of Public Law 101-576, the Chief Financial Officers Act. This law addresses long-standing Congressional and Administration concerns about financial management deficiencies in the Federal Government. These are deficiencies that must be corrected.

In passing the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (CFOs Act), the Congress found that "[b]illions of dollars . . . lost each year through fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement . . . could be significantly decreased by improved management." As a remedy, the CFOs Act (passed by voice vote without dissent): (1) strengthens management capabilities; (2) provides for improved accounting systems, financial management, and internal controls to assure reliable information and deterrence of fraud, waste, and abuse; and, (3) provides for reliable financial information, useful to Congress and the Executive Branch in financing, managing, and evaluating Federal programs. Implementation of the CFOs Act is essential to good Government.

The Administration objects to the language of section 506, which would bar the use of appropriated funds to conduct certain studies of the pricing of hydroelectric power. In signing this FY 1991 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, the President objected to language identical to the language in section 506 on constitutional grounds. The Constitution grants the President the authority to recommend to the Congress any legislative measures considered "necessary and expedient." Any restrictions on studies would be interpreted so as not to limit the President's ability to carry out his constitutional responsibilities.

More detailed Administration comments on H.R. 2427 are contained in an Attachment.

ATTACHMENT

MAJOR PROVISIONS OPPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION A. FUNDING LEVELS

Department of Defense—Civil: Army Corps of Engineers

The Administration objects to the net increase in funding for the FY 1992 Corps of Engineers program of \$115 million over the President's request. In addition, the Committee provides funds for the initiation of 19 projects or project elements, restitution of funds for projects, and funds for operation and maintenance of seven additional projects not in the President's budget request. Most of these projects are uneconomical, do not meet cost-sharing requirements, or are not

Federal responsibilities. Further, the Committee added over \$40 million to initiate over 70 unregulated studies. These projects and studies are funded by a combination of new funds and elimination of the critical coastal America initiative (5-7 million), elimination of 10 of the President's 11 proposed high priority construction and major rehabilitation new start projects (-\$43 million) as well as unjustified savings and slippage (-\$43 million).

Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation

The Administration objects to the Committee's failure to fund the proposed transfer of oversight responsibility for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) dam safety program to the Bureau of Reclamation. A report by the Department of the Interior Inspector General found that BIA had not effectively managed the program from either an engineering or financial standpoint. BIA has not adequately addressed the serious threats to life and property posed by unsafe dams since issuance of the report in 1989. The Administration proposes to use the technical and management expertise of the Bureau of Reclamation to acquire the timely correction of serious safety deficiencies at a number of high-hazard BIA dams. Indian tribes would participate in implementing corrective actions on reservation dams, including provision for contracting with tribes.

The Administration objects to the addition of funds for several projects in the construction program that are a low priority, are not a Federal responsibility, or are inconsistent with cost-sharing requirements.

Department of Energy

The Committee disregarded the Administration's priorities within the Energy Supply Research and Development account. The Administration has requested \$28 million for activities related to shutting down the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) reactor in Hanford, Washington. This reactor has no programmatic purpose, and this is the second year that the Administration has proposed cleaning the reactor. Instead, the Committee cut three Space nuclear power programs (the SF-100 program, the thermal power supply program, and the new Space Exploration Initiative) in order to provide the \$79 million to keep the FFTF reactor running for another year.

Other Independent Agencies

Tennessee Valley Authority. The Committee bill increases funding by 48 percent over the Administration's request. The increase would continue rural development activities that should be conducted by State or local governments. Further, this unwarranted substantial increase in funding would maintain funding for fertilizer activities that should be made self-supporting and increase natural resource activities that, in part, duplicate the responsibility of other Federal, State and local jurisdictions.

B. LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

Department of Defense—Civil: Army Corps of Engineers

Many of the low priority studies and construction projects contained in the Committee bill have specific funding levels and features prescribed in bill language, thereby reducing programmatic flexibility.

Section 103 attempts to prohibit non-Federal financing of preconstruction engineering and design costs of certain projects prior to commencement of construction. It is undesirable because joint financing of engineering and design for large complex projects ensures non-Federal sponsors' commitment to

project implementation and the timely resolution of design issues.

Department of Energy

Power Marketing Administrations. Report language accompanying the Committee bill rejects the Administration's debt repayment reform proposal. The Administration asks the House to reconsider the debt repayment reform proposal. If implemented the proposal is estimated to provide the Federal government an additional \$393 million in revenues.

Supporting Research and Technical Analysis. The bill directs \$3 million to the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium. Neither the Consortium nor the grants given for research under the Consortium have undergone competitive review under Request for Proposals open to the entire university community.

University Research Support. The bill directs \$4 million to the cooperative arrangement that exists among Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ann G. Mendez Educational Foundation, and Jackson State University. The activities of these institutions are not subject to the normal peer review process to establish the merit of the work performed.

Minority Participation in the Superconducting Super Collider. Section 304 of the bill would require that the Secretary of Energy ensure "to the fullest extent possible" that at least ten percent of the funds of the Superconducting Super Collider go to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals within the meaning of the Small Business Act and to universities and colleges with student bodies that are more than 20 percent Hispanic or Native American. This provision does not appear to constitute a rigid set-aside; however, it does direct the Secretary to make an effort to direct funds to specified individuals and groups.

The distribution of Federal funds based solely on the racial composition of an institution's student body is inconsistent with the equal protection component of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. Under existing case law, racial or ethnic characteristics justify disparate treatment only in extremely rare situations and such situations must be clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate. The Administration is not aware of any such justification to support this set-aside and therefore recommends its deletion.

General Provisions

Litigations on Studies Concerning Hydroelectric Power Rates. Section 506 of the bill would bar the use of appropriated funds to conduct certain studies concerning the pricing of hydroelectric power. The Administration objected to identical language in the FY 1991 appropriation, and the President included in his signing statement the following remarks on the subject:

Section 504 of the Act provides that none of the funds appropriated by [the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act] or any other legislation may be used to conduct studies concerning "the possibility of changing from the currently required 'at cost' to a 'market rate' or any other noncost-based method for the pricing of hydroelectric power" by Federal power authorities. Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution grants the President authority to recommend to the Congress any legislative measures considered "necessary and expedient." Accordingly, in keeping with the well-settled obligation to construe ambiguous statutory provisions to avoid constitutional questions, I will interpret section 504 so as not to infringe on the Executive's authority to conduct studies that might assist in the evaluation and preparation of such measures.

If section 506 of the current bill is enacted in its current form, the Administration will interpret it in an identical fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I express again my appreciation and respect for the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for 1992, and that I be permitted to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2427, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today for your favorable consideration the bill, H.R. 2427, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year 1992. I am joined in this effort by my colleagues on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee who have worked long and hard to bring this legislation to the floor. Let me express my special appreciation to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. As in years past, he and I have worked together with the subcommittee without any trace of partisanship to fashion a bill that meets the present and future needs of our entire country. I also want to express my appreciation and thanks to the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DYER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO]. I want to also thank Chairman WHITTEN, a member of the subcommittee, and Mr. MCDADE for their assistance. I would like to note that we have three new members on the subcommittee this year, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. DWYER, and Mr. GALLO, and they have proven to be valuable additions to the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to point out to Members of the House that this bill is within the section 602(b) allocation for both new budget authority and outlays. I caution Members that any amendments offered to increase appropriations for any programs in this bill will put it over our allocation amount as it applies to budget authority because we are right at our ceiling.

The committee believes that this is the best bill that could be developed within the severe budget constraints that we faced. The bill includes no new major construction starts for the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, or Department of Energy. The fiscal year 1992 funding level is so tight that financing new programs or projects would severely impact ongoing programs. In addition, the budget summit agreement for domestic programs in fiscal year 1993 is even more restrictive. We expect to face a bigger problem next year so we chose not to initiate projects with outyear mortgages for which future funding may not be available.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the Committee today would provide \$21,529,999,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, and eight independent agencies and commissions. The bill includes \$11,780,000,000 for defense activities and \$9,749,999,000 for domestic programs. The amount for defense is the same as the budget request, and the amount for domestic programs is \$114,829,000 below the administration's request.

I would like to note that the total amount recommended in the bill is \$21,494,999,000 in new budget authority. However, the Congressional Budget Office has scored the bill at a total amount of \$21,529,999,000 due to an adjustment needed to compensate for \$35 million of excess revenues received in the uranium enrichment account. The \$21,529,999,000 is equal to the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

TITLES I AND II—WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chairman, the committee is committed to a policy of development of the vital water supply, navigation flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric projects that are necessary to the well-being and economic growth of the entire Nation. No part of this country is immune from the problems of water—too little or too much—and all States of the Union must join together cooperatively to foster a truly national water policy which responds to the unique needs of each State and region.

Title I includes \$3,609,849,000 for the Corps of Engineers which provides for 537 water resource projects in the planning or construction phases.

Title II includes \$887,218,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation which provides for 106 water resources projects in the planning or construction phases.

Titles I and II also provide for studies and projects in the operation and maintenance category. Within the available funds, the subcommittee has attempted to accommodate the most critical needs, within budget constraints, identified through the extensive hearings conducted with administration witnesses, the public, State, and local officials and Members of Congress. It was unfortunate this year that the committee was unable to provide for new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers in this bill, but we did seek to maintain adequate funding for those projects which are ongoing.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

In title III, for the Department of Energy, the recommendation provides a total of \$16,656,297,000. In this title, we are recommending \$11,768,500,000 for the national security programs and \$4,887,797,000 for all other energy programs. The amount recommended for energy research programs maintains a balanced energy research program and a healthy scientific research effort. The recommendations include many

changes in the request which are summarized in the report. I will mention a few.

In the energy programs of the Department of Energy, several changes are worth mentioning:

For solar and renewable energy programs, we are recommending \$237,219,000 compared to the budget request of \$202,094,000.

For environmental restoration and cleanup activities at Department of Energy defense and nondefense facilities, the committee recommendation is \$4,351,395,000, an increase of \$122,900,000 over the budget request.

For nuclear energy R&D, the recommendation is \$314,658,000, a decrease of \$84 million from the budget request. Due to severe budget constraints, the committee was unable to fund the proposed new space exploration initiative nor the requested increase in space reactor power systems.

For general science and research, the committee recommendation provides a total of \$1,405,489,000, a decrease of \$143,450,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes \$433,700,000 for the superconducting super collider, a decrease of \$100 million from the budget request. In addition, the committee recommendation does not include the \$43,450,000 requested to initiate the construction of the Fermi Lab main injector. The reductions were necessary due to the severe budget constraints the committee faced.

The recommendation for defense programs of \$11,768,500,000 is \$231,486,000 above the current appropriation and \$500,000 more than the budget request. The recommended level includes increased funds for defense waste cleanup as I noted previously.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Title IV of the bill includes \$341,635,000 for eight independent agencies. This is \$287,713,000 below last year's level.

We have provided \$170 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission; \$135 million for the Tennessee Valley Authority; \$11,500,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; \$3,294,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, and \$1,879,000 for three river basin commissions.

The committee recommendation provides \$508,810,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, an increase of \$47,490,000 from last year's level and the same as the budget request. The appropriation is offset by revenues of \$488,848,000, resulting in a net appropriation of \$19,962,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill contains the customary general provisions carried in prior years to permit the agencies funded in this bill certain flexibility and to limit other activities.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The report accompanying the bill provides a good explanation of the recommendations reflected in the bill. I would encourage the Members to look through it.

This is a good bill. I recommend its adoption.

□ 1320

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, once again the appropriations process has started. This particular bill on the appropriations for energy and water once was called the all-American bill. Appropriately it would be called the all-American bill, because it touches everyone of us in some fashion, usually in more than one way. It touches every community. It touches every individual regardless of age and what section of the country he may live in.

After 2 months of hearings, listening and receiving testimony from more than 100 of our colleagues, a number of Governors, and thousands of individuals who sent in their testimony as well as appearing in person, the committee has come to the floor with an appropriations bill to provide for the energy needs for the immediate future, and future for our children and grandchildren. Besides that, we also have the water needs of our country included here.

Energy, the power that is now providing the light for this room, and thank goodness the air-conditioning also for this room in the Capitol and in most of our homes, as well as the other energy needs of our country, to provide for all the needs we take for granted. We also take water for granted. Yet we have some areas of our country today that have excess amounts of water and cannot accommodate all the water they do receive, while other sections do not have a sufficient amount to meet their municipal and industrial needs.

This committee has the responsibility of providing, hopefully, the research for the energy needs of our children and grandchildren, also for developing the resources of how to handle the water, as well as the ports and inland navigation. Funding for more than 25,000 miles of inland navigation are provided through the efforts of this committee.

So it truly is an all-American bill. However, this year is probably one of the most austere, one of the tightest years we have ever had. Through the years that the chairman and I have been on this committee, we have had some tight years, but none like this year. Many Members of the House of Representatives and the other body, the Senate, have requests for projects that simply could not be put in. We had requests from people throughout the

country, Governors, State legislators, county commissioners, mayors, who have very dire needs for flood control or additional support for programs within their communities, that just were not possible this year.

In previous years we have had problems, but now this committee and every Appropriation Subcommittee that will be bringing bills to the floor in the next 30 days has had the same problems. We have always had problems with appropriations, trying to appropriate money up to a point as much as we have available with the authorizing committees. Usually you have to struggle to try to hold spending down with the authorizing committees, with the special interest groups throughout the country all wanting more money appropriated. We have always had that struggle, but more recently now we have problems with the budget process. We have our own Budget Committee here in the House and in the Senate who also inject a new figure.

We have something new now, the 602(b) allocations. It used to be a 302(b) allocation, from the cardinals of the Appropriations Committee who divide up the pie even further. So it makes it very difficult when we take into account all the considerations that an Appropriations Subcommittee has to come up with, trying to write an appropriation bill, and it is becoming increasingly more difficult for us to do this.

I support this recommendation wholeheartedly. Some of the items that the chairman has already identified, the priority and the hard work, I agree with. The biggest increase this year, the largest increase in this bill is in environmental improvement.

We have a great many facilities throughout the country that have been operating for a number of years, producing nuclear materials, which have been neglected and now need cleanup. We have provided additional funds this year for cleanup in the nuclear defense activities. There is an increase up to \$3,749,000,000 for the defense cleanup.

We have \$602 million for cleanup of non-defense-related activities, producing nuclear materials. That is the largest item, the environmental cleanup.

The second largest item in our budget is the general science and research account. Again, this funds projects looking into the future so that we can provide more energy and deliver energy more efficiently, more effectively and conduct research on alternate sources of energy. These are the areas where we also have the second largest increase in our bill.

This bill is above last year by \$607 million. It is, as the chairman has said, \$115 million below the President's request. It is five-tenths of 1 percent below the President's request; so it is a very austere appropriation this year. It

is one in which there is no room for any increases.

□ 1330

So if anyone here has a notion or an idea about increasing someplace along the line, you had better also have a notion about where it is going to come from because we just simply do not have any room to make any increases. Any further increases and we would not be able to bring the bill to a final vote on the floor for any increases unless there is a corresponding reduction.

It is a good bill. I realize there will be Members speaking this afternoon about projects they would like to put in. The committee had no prejudice. It was not something that we decided that we would chop this one off. It was just a matter of that we could not put any new money in for new starts, not only for this year but for future years down the road. Every time we have a new start, it obligates the future for additional funds.

This afternoon we are also going to hear about the Office of Management and Budget, which has not been happy with every item that this subcommittee chose to put into this bill. Nothing new about this.

Some of us have been around here for a number of years. Every administration, Democrat and Republican, has had its priorities. The President sends his request down in January. In the 25 years I have been here we have always taken it apart. We in the Congress who are closest to the people, closer to the projects—the committee has hearings, we go out and visit and look at the sites and look at the programs—have always had a difference in priorities. We are going to hear that we did not put in as much as the President requested or we put in more for some other program. The important thing is not the one item that the President requested. There were a number of items that President Bush requested that we were not able to put in. But that is not the question, whether or not we put in everything he wanted or whether we did not put in everything that he wanted. The question is the bottom line. And we have held under that. That is what we must look at, we must look to the future and that we do not overobligate this Congress or future Congresses. This bill does not do that. It is a very good bill.

I hope it is one that will receive the vote of everyone here. It is austere. But I join my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman BEVILL, in thanking the members of the subcommittee and the full committee and especially our staff under the able leadership of Hunter Spillan, who once again spent hundreds of hours putting this bill together. It is a good bill, and I hope you all can support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

MR. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am a member of the subcommittee and, believe me, in the history of our Nation we never faced greater problems from floods and other disasters over the Nation. On May 22, 1991, by a vote of 387 to 33, we called on the Office of Management and Budget to send up a request for funds for unfunded disasters and emergencies.

Since October 1990, the beginning of this fiscal year, there have been over 28 disasters certified by the President. We need to continue to take care of the country and respond to these needs.

May I say at this time to our good friends, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and to my other colleagues on the subcommittee, that they have done a great job. I would like to point out that one of the tragedies we have, is those persons who seem to think that if you spend money on your own country, it is porkbarrel. May I say that all we have behind our money is the country itself. We no longer have gold and silver behind it.

Mr. Chairman, these are investment expenditures. Everything we have is changing the environment to serve our needs and our purposes.

I want to say here that we are all indebted nationally to the members of this subcommittee and their counterparts on the other side of the Capitol because everything we have and everything we hope to be comes back to our own country.

I know we talk about trade. But the question is how you trade. Did you get beat, or did you look after your own country?

I want to say here, and I mean every word of it, except for the work that this committee has done with the support of the Congress, we would not be able to hold on to what we have.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues Chairman TOM BEVILL and ranking Republican JOHN MYERS, and with my other subcommittee colleagues in recommending this bill to you. As has been pointed out, this is the major bill for looking after the physical resources of our country itself—which is our real wealth. Along with the bill for agriculture, it is the foundation of our economy.

It is hard sometimes to look after your own country, but the problems we have today are not the result of what we spend on our own country. We must spend on our country if we are going to be economically strong enough to do all these other things.

Mr. Chairman, the overall content of this bill has been covered by Chairman BEVILL and JOHN MYERS.

I want to call attention to some of the national programs that are of special interest to my district, State, and section.

For the Foothills Joint Demonstration Erosion Control Program, funds are included for work on Batupan Bogue, Otoucalofa Creek, Hotophia Creek, Hickahala and Senatobia Creeks, Long Creek, Black Creek, Burney Branch, Town Creek-Charleston, Sherman Creek, Abiaca Creek, Toby Tubby Creek, Pelucia Creek, Cane-Mussacuna Creeks, Hurricane-Wolf Creeks, and the Coldwater River.

For other ongoing construction, funds are included for the Nonconnah Creek project, the Sardis Dam—dam safety assurance, the Tombigbee River and Tributaries project, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway—purchase of mitigation lands, the Horn Lakes Creek and Tributaries project, and the Gulfport Harbor project. Funding is also included to continue the Jackson metro area study, and for the East Fork, Tombigbee River operation and maintenance. Language is also included in the bill providing that O&M funding for Yazoo Basin Lakes shall be available for maintenance of roads and trails.

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, rural development activities are maintained at the current level. Efforts are directed at helping to eliminate the economic hardships in the valley's rural areas.

For the Appalachian Regional Commission, highway program and area development activities are also maintained at current levels. This funding supports the continued construction of Corridor V. Report language directing ARC to develop a plan for waste disposal in Northeast Mississippi has also been included.

Funding in this bill also continues a cooperative agreement between Jackson State University, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation, an ongoing program.

For the Yazoo Basin, funding is provided to continue construction on the Big Sunflower project, the demonstration erosion control projects, the tributaries project, the Upper Yazoo projects, and for backwater mitigation lands. The reformulation study—Yazoo Basin projects—is also funded as well as operation and maintenance for all completed Yazoo Basin Projects.

FIRST FISCAL YEAR 1992 APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. Chairman, this is the first of our appropriations bills. Friday, we will take up the military construction bill and next week we expect to take up the VA, HUD, and independent agencies bill, the Department of Defense bill, and the legislative branch appropriations bill. They will be followed by

bills for Labor-HHS, dealing with health and education and Social Security, Transportation, providing for highways, Treasury-Postal Service, Interior, including funds for the Natchez-Trace and forestry, and the others.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, the total of appropriations bills has been kept \$180,800 million below the recommendations of the Presidents since 1945. The money in this bill is investment spending. It is not what we have spent on our own country which causes our financial problems.

Our Committee on Appropriations has done a fine job in this bill which provides funds to take care of our own country. We should all keep in mind that ours is a large country and this bill touches every State and area. Although the funds in this bill are large, it doesn't begin to do what could or should be done to protect and develop our country.

We must realize our only real material wealth is the Nation itself. This is all we have to back our money. That is what all our other commitments depend upon.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], a new member of our subcommittee, and a very valuable and hardworking member.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2427. As a new member of the subcommittee, I would like to thank Chairman BEVILL and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their leadership and direction. I would also like to thank the dedicated and capable staff of the subcommittee for their expertise and knowledge of these important issues.

I am proud of the fact that we have crafted a bill that will continue to move this country closer to a comprehensive energy policy. And, we have done so while staying within 602(b) budget allocations.

With this bill we have also made a significant long-term commitment to the development of new energy sources for our future needs.

The immediate goal of our national energy policy must be a balanced approach that deals with conservation and alternative fuel sources. We must not shortchange our research and development programs. If we fail to act now, we will be passing along to our next generation energy problems that could be solved if we invest in new technologies now.

Often times we find it very difficult to finance research projects to meet our future energy needs. However, we must make that commitment now. Without this investment in research today, we are dooming our future generations to a lower standard of living and less economic opportunity.

I believe this bill takes that necessary step. Within this bill we have funded programs that will make this country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. We have funded scientific research that will give us the edge and the capability to take this country into the 21st century.

This bill also provides funding for a number of critical flood control projects throughout the United States. These important projects will help to prevent hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage in areas with recognized flooding problems. It is even more important that these projects move forward in order to save the countless lives lost to devastating floods.

This bill provides the needed relief to those areas stricken each year by floods.

Preparing for our future needs is never easy, but H.R. 2427 provides the insight and programs that will make it a little easier.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of the subcommittee for the work that it does on this bill, especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

I happen to have an office a few feet down the hall from where they hold their hearings, and for several months at the beginning of this year I would look out of my office and see 50 or 60 people waiting out in the hall to testify before this subcommittee.

I see here, Mr. Chairman, a stack of printed hearings on the table, which indicates the amount of work that they do to prepare this bill.

There are so many items in this bill. I do not think very many people understand how many individual projects and items they have to go into to prepare this bill.

In addition to that, I do want to mention something about the Corps of Engineers. I think about half of this bill is defense-related. Some people think of the Corps of Engineers as flood control experts, doing things that help this country. But as a matter of fact, they are very crucial in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, I happened to have been in the Persian Gulf, in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, both during the war in the Persian Gulf and afterward. The Corps of Engineers were absolutely crucial in that process.

But for the corps and their expertise on handling facilities and bridges and different things like that, the Army

could not have been as mobile as they were. There is no way they could have been.

In addition to that, after the war was over the first thing the Kuwaitis wanted was advice from the Corps of Engineers, not money to do projects but just advice, because they know that that kind of advice is available nowhere else in the world. So I think we ought to think a lot about the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding this additional time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we were in New Guinea also. They wanted advice on a road that was to go across New Guinea. That is what they needed more than anything else, not money to build the road, but advice. It is not available anywhere else like it is from the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers needs to do these civil works projects in peacetime so that they will be prepared for the emergencies that come up, such as we had in the Persian Gulf. If they do these projects, they are helping people in this country during peacetime. I think the greatest foreign aid program we could have, would be to have the Corps of Engineers go to more places in the world to provide advice to other countries on their civil needs to fix up their countries.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for this bill.

□ 1340

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the energy and water appropriation bill that is on the floor before us today. I realize the difficult decisions that the subcommittee and the full committee had to make in this era of tightened budgets, but I do think that the bill that they have reported is a good bill, worthy of support.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically want to rise in support of that section of the bill that deals with funding the superconducting super collider high energy particle accelerator, better known as the SSC. This is a basic research project. It is the highest science priority of the Bush administration. It is a project that we have spent approximately \$480 million Federal dollars to date, and it is a project that the President asks that we spend an additional \$534 million in the budget year that we are debating on the floor this afternoon.

The committee, because of the difficult decisions that they had to make for other projects, cut the President's request by \$100 million, so instead of

receiving \$534 million, the SSC is only going to receive \$434 million. So, the first point I would like to make with regard to the funding of the SSC is that we have already cut the President's request by \$100 million.

Mr. Chairman, as we get into the debate later on this afternoon, there are going to be a series of amendments offered to kill funding for the SSC or to reduce funding for the SSC. I would respectfully urge my colleagues to vote against those amendments for several reasons.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, the project is being built on time, under budget, and we are making excellent technical progress on the project. The magnet testing program is going extremely well. As a matter of fact, the magnets are exceeding the standards of required performance. We are in negotiations with foreign partners to fund parts of the cost of the super collider, and we hope within the next year to get significant contributions from the Japanese.

If we begin to go down the path of delaying funding of the project, and please keep in mind that this year's request, \$374 million, was for construction, of which \$100 million has already been cut so we are down to \$274 million in construction, we begin to delay the time it takes to build it. The final costs begin to go up, and we could get into a cycle of self-fulfilling prophecies where the proponents say the cost is going up, and, therefore, we should kill it. We can only keep it on schedule and under budget if we fund it as closely as possible to the President's request, which was \$534 million.

Mr. Chairman, our future in this country is technology driven. We can only be competitive in the 21st century if we have the world's best scientists, the world's best engineers, and the world's best technology. The price to pay for world leadership in that arena is very expensive. The SSC is budgeted to cost \$8.25 billion to construct, but the price we pay, if we do not play in that arena, is even greater, because one-third of our gross national product is derived today from basic research in past high energy particle accelerator projects. So, whether we like it or not, if we are going to be a world leader, we have got to pay the ante to get into the game, and the ante in this case is \$534 million this year for the SSC, which as I pointed out earlier has already been cut by \$100 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues, when we get to the SSC killer amendments, to vote against them. Let us fund the committee's request for the SSC of \$434 million.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, the energy and

water development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first of 13 annual appropriations bills, and I want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], as well as all of the chairmen, for the work they are doing in terms of meeting the requirements of the budget agreement. In particular, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] who have done an excellent job here in staying within the constrictions laid out within the budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides \$21.5 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$20.5 billion in discretionary outlays. I am pleased to note that the bill is at the level of discretionary budget authority and under the domestic discretionary outlays by \$83 million as established by the 602 spending subdivision for this subcommittee.

The budget agreement obviously sets some very tough caps, as we all know, and it demands some very tough decisions below those caps, but it takes balance and care, and it also takes toughness, and I think that is what this subcommittee has done in meeting its requirements.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I plan to inform the House of the status of all spending legislation, and will be issuing a "Dear Colleague" on how each appropriations measure compares to the 602(b) subdivisions.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee on its other bills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1991.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached are fact sheets on H.R. 2427, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, and H.R. 2426, the Military Construction Appropriations Bill, for Fiscal Year 1992. These bills are scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 29, and Friday, May 31, respectively, subject to adoption of rules.

These are the first regular fiscal year 1992 appropriations bills to be considered and both bills are at or below the 602(b) subdivision.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

FACTSHEET ON H.R. 2427, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR (H. REPT. 102-75)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992 on Wednesday, May 22, 1991. This bill is scheduled for floor action on Wednesday, May 29, subject to a rule being adopted.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(B) SUBDIVISION
COMPARISON TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING
SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$21,530 million of discretionary budget authority total-

ling the defense and domestic budget authority in the bill. This is the same amount provided by the Appropriations budget authority 602(b) subdivision for this subcommittee. This bill provides \$20,540 million of discre-

tionary outlays (totalling defense and domestic outlays in this bill). This is under the discretionary outlay subdivision by \$83 million.

Since the Budget Enforcement Act established defense, international affairs, and domestic discretionary caps, this table compares the bill's spending in those 3 categories with the equivalent breakout of the 602(b) spending subdivisions.

(In millions of dollars)

	Energy and water development appropriations bill		Appropriations committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over (+)/under (-) 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Defense Discretionary Spending Subdivision						
Discretionary	11,780	11,443	11,780	11,443		
Mandatory						
Total	11,780	11,443	11,780	11,443		
Domestic Discretionary Spending Subdivision						
Discretionary	9,750	9,097	9,750	9,180		-83
Mandatory						
Total	9,750	9,097	9,750	9,180		-83

BA = New Budget Authority
0 = Estimated Outlays

The House Appropriations Committee ordered reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays on May 22, 1991. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

The following are the major program highlights for the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992, as reported:

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Atomic Energy Defense Programs ¹	11,769	7,463
Army Corps of Engineers	3,610	2,503
Bureau of Reclamation	882	726
DOE General Science	1,405	914
Energy Supply R&D	2,854	1,284
Uranium Enrichment (Gross)	1,338	1,070
Nuclear Waste Fund (Civilian)	305	153
Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC)	170	9
Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)	135	33

¹ The Atomic Energy Defense program funds are part of Function 050, National Defense. The other accounts shown above are domestic discretionary programs.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to speak about the Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Program [EMP]. After persistent efforts in Congress since 1982, I am proud to finally see the EMP will likely be fully funded next year.

The EMP began as a concept for protecting the environment- and recreation-based economies along the upper Mississippi River against the effects of increased commercial river use. Now, more than 10 years after that concept was put on paper, and as the program is poised for full funding for the first time, it is appropriate to reassess our goals.

To do so, we should go back to the basic thrust of the program. First, what is the EMP?

EMP is the result of a hard-fought compromise between navigation and environmental interests. In 1981, I put

together a group of river enthusiasts to form a river advisory committee. This group generated 10,000 letters to Congress in support of getting the plan written into law. In addition, the EMP was strongly supported by the Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association, and the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee. We first testified before Congress for the plan in 1982.

The program was authorized in 1986 as part of Water Resources Development Act (Public Law 99-662, section 1103). It is the first program of its kind to combine a joint effort between the Army Corps, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and five States. The program covers 1,280 miles of the upper Mississippi River system.

Since that time, the EMP has become a model for the Nation and the world. In testimony before Congress last year, February 26, 1990, the Army Corps described the EMP as "a model for future efforts around the Nation and we—the corps—are proud to be a part of this unique initiative."

EMP is recognized as a unique partnership that works. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and managers from many other river systems are very enthusiastic about the EMP and its application elsewhere. Additionally, Soviet scientists recently toured the EMP for the second time to learn more about the program.

In a nutshell, the EMP paved the way for achieving harmony between navigation and environmental interests. It has allowed us to progress beyond the lawsuits and confrontation of the 1970's and 1980's over construction of Lock and Dam 26. This relationship is built on the understanding that further progress in navigational and commercial use on the upper river is dependent upon greater attention to environmental concerns and recreational use.

Second, why is the EMP so important for the upper Mississippi River?

The upper Mississippi River system is the only river in the United States which has a dual congressional mandate, incorporating both a 9-foot commercial navigation channel, and over 300,000 acres designated as part of the National Wildlife and Fish Refuge System. The upper river is used by millions of people each year for recreation, swimming, boating, fishing, and hunting. And, the upper river alone has over 200 boat harbors and 445 recreation sites.

Over \$1.5 billion is spent each year by recreationists along the upper river. Last year, over 32 million tons of cargo were transported by barges along the system. EMP helps balance the increasing commercial navigation use of the system by restoring, maintaining, and preventing habitat losses due to man's increasing use of the system.

Third, what is the Federal role in the EMP?

It is clear to residents of the upper Mississippi River that there is a renewed Federal commitment to our region generally, and to the EMP specifically. President Bush stated in his first budget proposal on Natural Resources and Environment funds that they should be used to "redress the history of environmental neglect at federal facilities around the country; to expand understanding of environmental processes and possible response strategies."

This might well have been said of the EMP. President Bush must be commended in committing the resources necessary to "expanding the understanding of environmental processes" on the upper Mississippi, and for making "response strategies" available under the EMP.

Last year, I brought John Turner, Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Robert Page, then-Director of the Army Corps of Engineers, and Assistant Secretary of Interior Constance Harriman up to tour the EMP. I promised them that, once they saw the EMP first hand, they would be compelled to push for full funding for the funding for

the program. They helped me keep my promise by lobbying to fully fund the EMP for the first time next year.

The administration submitted its budget request for fiscal year 1992, requesting \$19.45 million for the EMP. I am grateful, and proud, that the House Appropriations Committee, members of which have also toured the EMP, shepherded that request to the House floor. The EMP continues to forge working relationships from groups of diverse interest.

Unfortunately, despite steady funding increases each year, the EMP has been underfunded since its first year. Prior to this appropriations bill, the EMP has been underfunded by \$30 million, or 50 percent:

Year	Authorized	Appropriated
1988	16.72	5.168
1989	18.56	7.5
1990	19.95	14.86
1991	19.46	17.0
1992	19.46	19.46
Total so far	94.15	63.988
Underfunded by		30.16
1993	19.46	
1994	19.46	
1995	19.46	
1996	19.46	
1997	19.46	
Total	191.45	63.988

In an effort to recover some of those lost funds, I introduced legislation last year (H.R. 186) to extend the authorization of the EMP for 5 years. After lobbying for the extension for several years, I was especially pleased that Congress not only extended the authorization for 5 years, but also authorized \$33 million in new funds for those 5 years. The bill was enacted as part of the 1990 Water Resources Development Act.

This action further represented the widespread support the EMP has enjoyed from both Congress and the administration. Last year, after appealing to the committee for more funds, the appropriators boosted funding by \$2 million over the administration's request. Then, in response to my request, the Army Corps also redirected an additional \$2 million to the EMP.

Finally, and to address the point I began with, it is time to ask, where do we go from here?

As a simple answer, we forge ahead, building on the progress we've made so far. For example, as a result of EMP monitoring of habitat projects, we should be able to better design new habitat projects which compensate even more effectively for navigation impacts on the river. And, the information we've gathered will help us design future navigation systems which are more compatible with the environment. The information will also assist us to properly plan and better manage hydropower, sedimentation, and water pollution.

However, more thoughtful reflection on the successes we've enjoyed and the direction we want to go, requires us to take a hard review of the EMP. Mid-course correction, are now necessary to assure we are accomplishing the congressional mandates of EMP. To the degree we can continue the successes of the past, we must be diligent in maintaining the EMP as a unique program, separate from the mix of other projects administered on the upper River. I will continue to be very diligent in this regard. The EMP is a model for the country, and for world. Its mission should not, and cannot be watered down from the proper function laid out for it over 10 years ago—to balance the environmental and recreational aspects of the river with commercial navigation uses. Nor should its funds, so carefully procured, be siphoned off for any use other than to meet the mission of the EMP mandate.

While I will continue my close personal involvement with the EMP, I will also dedicate my efforts to expanding the program across the country. Using the EMP as a model, I intend to work with Director Turner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Department of the Interior, to implement the EMP methodology on other rivers. Legislation I have drafted, "The National Interjurisdictional Rivers Act" will be ready soon to expand our successes with EMP to the Nation's other large rivers.

For now, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to Chairman BEVILL and Vice Chairman MYERS for their interest in and support for the EMP program. They have been patient with my pleas for assistance, and have found a way, each year, to keep the EMP on track. Naturally, I would also like to express my gratitude to John Turner, Robert Page, and Constance Harriman, who know the importance of the EMP. I look forward to working closely with Director Turner on this and other creative programs for our Nation's river habitats.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy.

As the gentleman is aware, the Army recently submitted to Congress a plan to reorganize the Army Corps of Engineers. Is it true that no funds appropriated by this bill are to be used for the reorganization, consolidation or elimination of any Army Corps of Engineers offices?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, yes, that is correct. My panel completed its consideration of the appropriation measure, H.R. 2427, prior to the submission of the corps reorganization proposal. That proposal certainly requires extensive and complete review by the committees with jurisdiction and the Appropriations Committee in the House and Senate.

Mr. VENTO. Therefore it is your intent and the committee's intent, that the Army Corps of Engineers does not use any of its fiscal year 1992 appropriations to relocate, merge, reduce or eliminate the St. Paul district office or any other office targeted under the Army Corps of Engineers reorganization plan? And, the approximately 815 employees working out of the St. Paul district office would not be forced to relocate or lose their jobs in fiscal year 1992?

Mr. BEVILL. Yes. The gentleman is correct. That is not the intent of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for his reassurances as I have serious reservations about the Army Corps of Engineers reorganization plan. I appreciate your clarifying that the funds cannot be used to implement any reorganization plan. Your assistance today will help ensure that Congress has sufficient time to properly scrutinize this DOD/USACE plan.

□ 1350

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation has received from the Department of the Army and from the Department of Defense proposed legislation dealing with the reorganization of the Corps of Engineers. It is the intention of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. NOWAK], chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, and received their commitment to hold hearings on the legislative proposal and to devise a means within which the proposed reorganization of the corps can be moved forward, subjected to public scrutiny as to the wisdom of the plan, the costs, the benefits, and the effects upon the public who are users of those services provided by the corps and are subject to regulation by the corps.

Ten years ago there was a corps realignment plan that was subject to public scrutiny by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which plan was revised in its final iteration, and which did serve the public in a much better way than the original

plan would have done. I share the gentleman's concern about the impact of the current corps plan upon Minnesota, the river district, and the lake district as well. It would have serious adverse effects on the public in our State and substantial adverse economic fallout for the city of St. Paul, and that plan needs to be subjected to scrutiny.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his assistance and help.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to fund energy and water development activities which are essential to the Nation's future.

Every subcommittee of our Committee on Appropriations is struggling again this year with the problem of balancing national needs against severely limited resources.

While the bill before the House today provides a modest increase in funding for ongoing projects, it is still \$114.8 million below the level proposed by the President. Leadership provided by the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MYERS, and work by members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and the subcommittee staff has made this possible.

It is easy, shortsighted, and dangerously unwise to put a porkbarrel label, as some have done, on the endeavors supported by this bill.

Work funded under the bill ranges from water conservation, flood control, navigation, and economic development to energy research and production and national defense.

In my home State of Arkansas water resources are a strong thread in the fabric of our past economic development and will be in our future development.

Most Arkansans know from their earliest years that the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is essential to success in our efforts to conserve, manage, and develop our resources. And, we know that achieving that goal is crucial for a sound economic future for Arkansas.

Corps of Engineers funding in this bill helps continue the Federal-local partnership in water resource management.

The Helena, Phillips County, AR, slackwater harbor construction project which receives \$6.2 million under this bill is a sound example of Arkansans' commitment to wise water resource management and to the Federal-local partnership which characterizes corps civil works.

The people of Helena and Phillips County understand that inland waterways transportation is essential to efficient and economical movement of Arkansas and American products to domestic and international markets. Despite the grinding economic poverty and high unemployment afflicting their region, they have committed their scarce local resources to paying the non-Federal share of the cost of the new slackwater harbor.

The Nation's economy and inland waterways transportation system will benefit from the can do spirit of these Arkansans. It is estimated that over the long-term up to 30,000 private sector jobs will come to the region because of the improved river transport facilities.

This is just one example of the sound future a firm national commitment to civil works can produce.

Energy independence has been an issue that has simmered on the back burner and bubbled on the front burner of public awareness at various times during the past 20 years. In the last 9 months U.S. experiences in the Middle East with Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and Desert Saber have helped elevate public support for freeing this Nation from dependence on foreign energy sources.

Funding included in this bill supports nonpetroleum-based energy activities, such as those associated with hydroelectric and nuclear power. This can help cure America of its addiction to foreign oil. It can help move the Nation toward energy independence.

Given the budget constraints under which it was formulated, the bill before us is sound and responsible. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman in a colloquy regarding the provision in the energy and water development appropriations bill providing impact aid to the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

As you know, the Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico have been engaged in negotiations on an agreement committing the Department to seek from Congress direct financial assistance for New Mexico to assess, monitor, and mitigate impacts resulting from WIPP. As a gesture of good faith, the Department requested funds for this purpose in its fiscal year 1992 budget. The House version of the Defense authorization bill, which passed on May 22, 1991, authorized these funds. The bill before us today would appropriate the \$20 million contained in the Department's amended budget request.

While the Armed Services Committee supports this good-faith request by the Department, final agreement on the amount of impact aid that the State of

New Mexico will receive for hosting the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant has not yet been reached. The State and the Department have not yet signed a formal agreement. More importantly, the Department would need to request and receive annual authorizations and appropriations for this agreement.

In an effort to avoid annual debates over this agreement, the administration's proposal for legislation to withdraw land for use of the WIPP, forwarded to Congress on April 11, 1991, contains language allowing the Secretary to provide payments to the State of New Mexico for the test, disposal, and decommissioning phases of the facility. If enacted, this would amount to direct appropriation, as well as authorization, of up to \$605 million.

The final provisions of land withdrawal legislation are far from certain. Representatives of the committees with jurisdiction over the legislation, Armed Services, Interior, and Energy and Commerce, have begun to informally explore a compromise package. While it is too early to tell if the three committees can reach a consensus, the amount and timing of impact aid are among the major issues that must be resolved. Thus while I support the impact aid funding contained in the appropriations bill, I think it is appropriate to note that the ultimate amount to be paid and conditions for payment remain to be decided.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with the gentleman that the ultimate amount and conditions for payment of future impact aid to the State of New Mexico for the WIPP project are still to be determined, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, today we are being asked to vote on the funding for one of the most important scientific projects ever undertaken in this country and in the world. When it is built, the superconducting super collider will be the premiere scientific facility for high energy physics research in the world.

Why should we build this project, and how will the basic scientific research conducted at this facility impact our lives?

The SSC will help scientists answer the fundamental questions about our universe that have been asked since the beginning of civilization. What are we made of? What is matter? How did the universe begin? Will it ever end?

Answers to these questions have been sought by philosophers and scientists throughout history. There probably are no greater fundamental questions than these.

Time magazine last year wrote a cover story on the SSC, and in that story it stated that the science gen-

erated by the SSC "should be nothing short of spectacular." It went on to say that the "SSC will clearly have the best chance of unlocking the deep secrets of the universe." Dr. T.D. Lee, Nobel laureate in physics, has been quoted as saying that the SSC "will be our contribution to the civilization of the next century."

Well, you may say, the SSC is a worthy project, but these are lean budgetary times and can we afford to build it? My answer to that question is that we cannot afford not to build the SSC. What if, for whatever reason, we had abandoned the research of particle physics at the early part of this century? The result would have been that progress in science-based technologies would have suffered immeasurably. We would be far behind in the development of semiconductors, transistors, quantum optics, lasers, supercomputers, biotechnology, space sciences, synchrotron radiation, superconductivity, and so on.

When you think of the investment opportunity we have in the SSC, I think you will agree that the SSC is one of the best bargains ever offered to the American public.

But why should America make such a commitment? Because we are a great country. And great countries do great things. A strong and bold nation, one that aspires to be the world leader in science and technology, must not shrink from the challenge to build the SSC. The SSC is an investment for our children—it is something to leave the next generation.

□ 1400

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427. I especially appreciate the fact that the committee has doubled the request of the administration for money for the Bureau of Reclamation's desalting technology program.

Within the United States and throughout the world, the demand for fresh water continues to increase. We in the West know that demand very much.

You know what is happening in California, Arizona, and Nevada. We are running out of water, and running out of water very fast. Severe drought conditions, demands of industrial and agricultural societies all stress the existing supplies of usable water.

Desalinization is the technology by which salt or brackish water is processed to remove salt or biological impurities. Until recently the United States was active in the development of desalinization technology. Renewing the U.S. leadership in desalinization technology could yield significant benefits. Some type of desalinization technology has been used by 46 States and

105 countries worldwide, but the cost is very high, and we need to develop more inexpensive methods of doing it. The barrier to this program is cost.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for their support in this farsighted program that we need to do.

At the same time as I came to praise Caesar, I would like to request that the committee, in reviewing title III, when they go to conference, and when the chairman and the conferees meet in conference, they look at the money that was allocated to the State of Nevada under this section, \$3 million, for the study of the nuclear disposal facilities at Yucca Mountain, NV.

The State of Nevada was of the understanding that almost twice this amount of money would be appropriated for the State of Nevada and the people of the State to review what is going on by the Department of Energy in determining whether Yucca Mountain was available and was the site to be used.

I would ask the committee when they get to conference, to please work with the Senate. Hopefully the Senate will put more money into the program, and the committee chairman and the conferees will keep the consideration of the people of the State of Nevada in mind when they work in conference.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the authorizing committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I came over here after listening to the debate to extend high compliments for this legislation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and particularly for the excellent way that the subcommittee and the full committee have been working with the authorizing committee.

Mr. Chairman, I know on the floor I have come over on a number of occasions and had different things to say about where we did not agree. I think all involved have done a superb job, and all the Members ought to know of the extraordinary working conditions now that have prevailed between the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKEN].

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and would like to congratulate him on making some difficult choices in this legislation. Particularly I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and other members of the Committee on Appropriations for mak-

ing available the amount of money necessary to begin to clean up our nuclear weapons facilities around the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my district the Fernald uranium processing plant. In my district, people living in the shadow of that processing plant live in fear every single day that their farms are going to be contaminated, that their drinking water is going to be polluted, that their livestock is going to be radioactively contaminated.

The Department of Energy has broken faith with those who live around these facilities for literally decades. But this legislation authorizes the amount of money necessary to begin the big task of cleaning up these facilities. Now it is up to the Department of Energy to make good on the promises they have made to these people for years and years.

Mr. Chairman, in supporting this legislation, I want to say that in making the difficult choices, the Committee on Appropriations has sent a loud and clear message to the Department of Energy: Get your act together. You have got the money, now get about the job of cleaning up these environmental nightmares that plague our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2427. This appropriations bill makes the final payment of \$50.9 million to the court-administered fund to conduct a long-term medical monitoring program for some 14,000 residents near the Fernald Feed Mill Production Center in the First District of Ohio. Fernald is an environmental nightmare established in 1951 by the DOE as part of its nuclear weapons complex.

Mr. Chairman, the settlement between the Department of Energy and the residents in the Fernald area totaled \$78 million, and result from more than 30 years of mismanagement and neglect on the part of the DOE and its operating contractor NLO. This mismanagement and neglect has allowed for numerous incidents of radioactive contamination of water and land around the Fernald uranium treatment center the health implications of which are still being discovered. Widespread fear of cancer abounds.

While the funds we are providing for today do not address another issue, I want to mention that one of the most urgent problems facing the people of Fernald is the imminent contamination of the drinking water supply serving the Fernald area. Tests have shown that radioactive material is moving closer and closer to the water supply. A number of private wells and cisterns have already been found to be contaminated. It is imperative that DOE recognize its responsibility to bring safe drinking water to those effected by mismanagement of our Nation's nuclear weapons complex.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the swift passage of this legislation so that the court administered fund can be used to conduct the necessary health testing and monitoring of the Fernald-area residents.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for producing an excellent bill. But my job is not to come to the well and talk about all the good that is in this bill, although there are plenty of good things in this bill for America. My job is to uncover that which does not pass the test of being worthy of our support.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening to all the hype on the superconducting super collider. We are going to get into that extensively a little bit later.

Let me say in addressing all that hype, I am going to repeat something I said before: the superconducting super collider will not cure cancer. It will not solve the problem of male pattern baldness. It will not guarantee a World Series victory for the Chicago Cubs. Is it good science? Probably. Is it high priority science? Not now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to pay attention as we get into the very serious debate on the Slattery amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding for a brief colloquy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership and for working with me on a Corps of Engineers flood control project important to the city of Aberdeen in my district.

Our area has suffered severe flooding over a number of years and this project would help protect public safety and the economic viability of the area. Although the local share of the project received approval by a majority of the voters, the required super majority was not obtained, and consequently the corps stopped work on the project. Since then, the city has been working hard to put together a revised flood control funding package which would receive the needed voter approval percentage in November 1991.

Mr. Chairman, if the city's financial share of the project is approved in the November referendum, would you support the corps' reinstituting work with the remainder of unspent funds appropriated for the project in fiscal year 1991?

Mr. BEVILL. Yes, I would support this.

Mrs. UNSOELD. I thank the chairman for his assistance in keeping my constituents safe and dry. It's always a pleasure working with you and your very capable staff.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to congratulate two great

Members, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], as the two outstanding, long-term leaders on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take 2 minutes to bring up to date the young Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent 15 years working on an issue called inertial confinement fusion. It is somewhat technical, but in short, it is an alternate clean source of energy.

Years back we had a breakthrough by a small company called KMS, which is in my district, Ann Arbor, MI. Under the guidance of Kip Segal, who died of a heart attack before the Joint Atomic Energy Commission, I believe in 1973.

□ 1410

The Russians had a world breakthrough in fusion under the leadership of a Nobel laureate named Nikolai Basov. This is an alternative kind of energy solution other than nuclear power. Some people are against nuclear power, as are some of the Members of Congress. They are also against coal research. They have moratoriums in three States in the Nation now on exploring oil. So we really have not, from a national policy standpoint, done a very good job of looking at alternative sources of energy.

This small, private company, funded with their own money, \$30 million, had the first breakthrough in the world in inertial confinement fusion. Along comes Sandia, Los Alamos, and Livermore in the defense category saying OK, we are going to put all fusion under the lead laboratory concept and invite KMS to participate as an 8-percent partner, which means that the Defense Department, in all due respect, was designing the policy for defense applications to fusion which we need. That should be reclassified, and I repeat that, that should be classified.

But one of the energy policy options that we do not consider often enough is, to look to the free market for creative scientists and creative research. There are no dollars, relatively speaking, for civilian applications of fusion. There are no breakthroughs in fusion. There has not been a breakthrough in magnetic fusion I think in over 30 years; nor in inertial confinement fusion in many years. But we are not giving any funds to the civilian scientists of this Nation to support creative research in achieving a breakthrough in an alternative source of energy for America.

When we have another gas crisis out here and we are short of fuel, people are going to say let us go to nuclear power. I support that. But a lot of Members of Congress do not.

So we are short on alternative solutions for energy independence in America. We are still dependent on the Mid-

dle East. I suggest from a national policy standpoint that we ought to look at fusion as a clean source of alternative energy, that the civilian scientists and the universities in this country competitively pursue peer review contracts for fusion research for America.

Someday our policy has got to move beyond the defense establishment. We need to look at a partnership with our private sector and our universities to create and refine new research for an alternative source of energy; namely, inertial confinement fusion. It is a complicated issue. Over the years, I have worked with Dr. Robert Hofstadter, who was a Nobel laureate from Stanford University, and who has now passed on. But there were many scientists in this Nation today who would like to do research in fusion. But it is now locked in the chambers of the Defense Department under "classified information."

I think we need to do both, the military and the civilian research for this Nation.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427.

Mr. Chairman, this past Friday, Secretary Dick Cheney released the Defense Department's proposed reorganization plan for the Army Corps of Engineers. The DOD proposal calls for the realignment of division and district offices and the consolidation of certain advisory and administrative functions. Specifically, the plan reduces the corps' nationwide divisions from 10 units to 6, reduces the corps' civil works districts from 35 to 22, and reduces those corps districts with military design and construction missions from 15 to 7.

In view of the release of DOD's corps reorganization plan and the far-reaching impact of the proposed realignment, I urge my colleagues to take a closer look at title I of the 1992 energy and water development appropriations legislation. The appropriations process annually funds the Corps of Engineers' study, planning, construction, operation, and maintenance of our Nation's water projects. Title I of the bill before us today appropriates \$3.6 billion for civil works functions under the Department of Defense and the Army Corps of Engineers. Particularly, the bill funds over 210 individual corps investigations projects, over 160 corps construction projects, and over 630 corps operation and maintenance projects.

The ongoing appropriation of funds for developing and maintaining our rivers and harbors is of great importance to myself and the constituents of Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District. The service of the 1,000 employees of the corps' Pittsburgh office has been invaluable to southwestern Pennsylvanians in providing high quality and cost effective public works engineering services to the Pittsburgh region and its communities. The Pittsburgh corps office oversees one of the largest inland waterway ports in the country, the continued development and navigation of the three major rivers in Pittsburgh, the main-

tenance of 14 percent of the Nation's locks and dams, 11 percent of lock and dam construction and the transport of 34 million tons of domestic cargo per year. While the DOD reorganization plan calls for its elimination, the projects currently being administered and those projects funded under the legislation today are testament to the significant role of the Pittsburgh corps office. In fact, DOD's own study testifies to the importance of the Pittsburgh office listing it 8th out of 36 on its national merit ranking with a score of 5.3 out of a best of 6.2.

The appropriations bill makes a further commitment of Federal dollars to programs and projects under the jurisdiction of the Pittsburgh office. The bill provides for investigative funding for rehabilitation of locks 2, 3, and 4 on the Monongahela River and provides for continued general construction funding for lock replacement on the Mon at Point Marion and Grays Landing. The continued development of Pittsburgh's inland waterways is essential to the sustenance and growth of the region, and I am very supportive and appreciative of the Appropriations Committee's commitment to this cause.

I urge my colleagues to take a closer look at the work of the Corps of Engineers and to analyze the DOD proposal. As evidenced with the Pittsburgh corps office, we must ensure that our civil works will continue to receive the attention based on the needs of our country, not unsubstantiated budget cuts.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY].

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 2427. I also rise to congratulate the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and their staffs for presenting to this body a balanced and thoroughly studied bill. From personal experience and now, as an elected official, I know the serious need for the programs under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, as I stand, recent rains and resulting floodwaters have inundated the Mississippi Delta. Over 2 million acres of land in the Mississippi Delta have flooded since February of this year. In the last 3 years, Mr. Chairman, my constituents have suffered through five floods with total damages in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

However, the perspective on this problem is not and cannot be just local or regional. The flooding problems in the Mississippi Delta are of national significance. Forty-one percent of the Nation's water drains down the Mississippi River basin, and in time, Mr. Chairman, this will have grave national consequences.

The flood control problems of my district are well known, and I am pleased to find that some of these problems are addressed in this appropriation bill.

The Upper Yazoo Basin projects, dating back to when Congress authorized

the Flood Control Act of 1936, consist of 179 miles of channel enlargements of the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, and Coldwater Rivers, and 210 miles of levees and drainage structures. The project is designed to reduce headwater flooding in the Upper Yazoo Basin by providing associated levee protection and increased channel capacity. This appropriations bill provides \$1,100,000 for the Big Sunflower project. This project includes the Upper Steele Bayou project and also initiates work on Black Bayou, a project critical to flood protection for the city of Greenville, the largest city in my district and the largest urban area in the northern half of Mississippi.

The committee has also provided \$2,318,000 for the Tallahatchie River maintenance project, or Main Stem, and has encouraged the Corps of Engineers to expedite a maintenance contract for conclusion of this project. This will provide considerable relief of this region of the Mississippi Delta until the authorized channel enlargement project construction reaches this area.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also recognizes the significant problems posed by erosion and drainage problems across the United States, and has included \$19 million for fiscal year 1992 to continue the Demonstration Erosion Control Program, a joint undertaking of the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service, which is so absolutely important.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman of the committee for his good work and that of the staff and of the entire committee. It means more than just flood control or basic research. Ultimately, it allows for the full enjoyment of property and for the full development of our natural resources. I appreciate the opportunity to express my support of this energy and water development appropriation bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill H.R. 2427, and to extend my congratulations to Mr. TOM BEVILL and the rest of the appropriations subcommittee on energy and water development for a job well done.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 3½ minutes to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a very important Member of this panel.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time. I do not intend to use the balance of the time. I simply want to say as a member of the subcommittee how much I appreciate serving under the direction of Chairman BEVILL and ranking member MYERS who have worked so closely together for so long to put a

very balanced, bipartisan bill before the Members again.

Our committee is always proud to be the first out onto the floor and usually the first signed. I think that is because we have always put this bill together with a great deal of sensitivity for the needs of people all across the Nation with all sorts of differing needs and concerns. For that I again want to compliment my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is not my privilege to serve on the subcommittee, but I would like to join in what the gentleman has said in thanking the chairman and ranking member who, with a very difficult situation, have always managed year after year to come up with a balanced bill which includes projects for flood control, navigation, and what have you. So I just want to join the gentleman for 30 seconds in saluting the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Indiana on a job well done.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I know many Members could say the same thing. Most of us will be rather reserved in our description of this bill from our own particular point of view because we do not want to identify how successful we may have been in this legislation.

□ 1420

But I do know that this leadership of the committee has long been recognized by their colleagues for their fairness and evenhandedness. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, H.R. 2427, providing for energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1991. This is a good and balanced bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, in particular I would like to point out to my colleagues that the bill provides a total of \$174 million for research and development into the various solar energy technologies. This represents a 34-percent increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1991 and \$31 million more than the President's budget request.

While many of the members advocated even larger increases, the solar and renewable energy budget was the only major category of energy research that received an increase in the bill. All of the other energy technologies were either cut or held to the levels requested by the administration.

So this increase in funding for solar and renewable technologies is significant, and I think it clearly reflects the progress that these technologies have made over the years—even during a prolonged constriction in funding and near abandonment by the previous administra-

tion—and the growing consensus that these technologies will play a major role in our energy security in the decades ahead. They are generally environmentally benign and do not contribute to warming of the planet.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the good work of the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL; Mr. MYERS, the ranking minority member; and, the subcommittee's dedicated staff. They have done an outstanding job over the years in putting together a balanced bill, and this year was no different.

Mr. Chairman, I would especially like to thank Mr. BEVILL and Mr. MYERS for their assistance in many varied needs of California. The bill is very generous to a number of key energy and water projects throughout the State of California, including a number of important projects in my district.

For example, the bill continues to support the efforts of the Corps of Engineers to address the flood threat to Sacramento and parts of Yolo County. The bill includes funds to continue progress on deepening the Port of Sacramento deepwater ship channel and to complete work on a project providing essential flood protection to two communities in my district, Fairfield and Suisun City. In addition, the bill continues to support a strong role for the Corps of Engineers in wetlands restoration, particularly in the central valley of California, where we have seen 98 percent of the historical wetlands destroyed over the years.

The bill also ensures that the Department of Energy will continue in a leadership role in furthering our understanding of the problems of climate change and developing proposals to mitigate the warming of the planet by continuing DOE support for the National Institute for Global Environmental Change. And, the bill approves the President's request for the DOE participation in the Human Genome Program, a program that will unlock the secrets to more effective treatments of a whole host of genetic-based diseases.

The bill—through its support for the SSC, general science, and other nuclear and high energy physics research—will help maintain our Nation's position as a world leader in science and technology.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. BEVILL and Mr. MYERS for their cooperation and support, and their sensitivity to the many water development and energy-related problems facing the Nation and the State of California, in particular. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the energy and water development bill gives us our first glimpse of how the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 affects the annual appropriations process. It makes absolutely clear that the budget agreement has imposed considerable discipline on the process: Spending constraints are real; they are difficult; and they narrowly limit the scope of appropriators' discretion.

The energy and water bill is a laboratory of fiscal restraint. The bill contains no new construction starts for water projects of the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. It includes no new construction projects for the Department of Energy. The bill total is \$115

million less than the President's budget request.

Far more remarkable than what the bill does not do, however, is what the bill does accomplish, given the subcommittee's spartan allocation. The work of the subcommittee's chairman, my good friend, the Honorable TOM BEVILL, has been outstanding. He has not been able to accommodate all of the numerous requests of Members, the public, and the administration, but he has demonstrated the wisdom of Solomon in dividing a small pie among many banqueters. He has made cuts that are painful but fair, and I congratulate him on his excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply indebted to the subcommittee's ranking Republican member, my dear friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN MYERS. The gentleman has devoted countless hours to crafting a bill that is balanced and fair. He has vigorously protected the interests of all Members, and I thank him for his dedicated efforts.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the work of the entire subcommittee warrants praise. The subcommittee works as a team, and I am proud to associate myself with its effort.

Mr. Chairman, the administration has expressed some concerns about the bill as reported by the committee. I look forward to working with the administration and with Members on both sides of the aisle to address these concerns as the bill works its way through the process.

Mr. Chairman, the energy and water development bill for fiscal year 1992 is within its 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. It contains \$3.6 billion for projects of the Army Corps of Engineers, \$115 million more than requested by the President and \$308 million above last year's level. The bill also includes \$887 million for the Bureau of Reclamation—\$4 million more than the President's request but \$79 million less than the fiscal year 1991 level. In allocating these funds, the subcommittee has emphasized the continuance of works in progress rather than the initiation of new construction projects with high outyear costs.

The bill provides \$16.7 billion for the programs of the U.S. Department of Energy, including \$11.8 billion for the atomic energy defense activities of DOE.

The subcommittee has wisely chosen to invest in our future energy independence by appropriating \$2.85 billion for the energy supply, research, and development activities of the Department. This represents an increase of \$33 million over the President's budget request and \$327 million over last year's level. It includes \$337 million, the full amount of the budget request, for magnetic fusion research. It also boasts an increase of \$31 million over the President's request for DOE's Solar and Renewable Energy Programs.

Also included in the energy and water bill is \$4.4 billion to continue the enormous job of environmental restoration at DOE's nuclear production facilities and national laboratories. This vast undertaking will take many years and many billions of dollars to complete. It drains resources from more exciting and glamorous projects, but it is an absolutely essential job, and the subcommittee is committed to

providing the resources necessary to accomplish it.

The bill provides \$434 million for the continued development of the superconducting super collider. Although this is a reduction of \$100 million from the President's request, it represents a healthy \$186 million increase over last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has reported a balanced, fair, and disciplined bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye".

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2427, the energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1992.

This bill appropriates a total of \$21.5 billion in fiscal year 1992 for the Energy Department's nuclear weapons programs, and for other Energy Department programs including supply, research, and development activities.

Importantly, this bill also provides for water projects carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, and various independent agencies such as the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC].

The \$21.5 billion total funding level represents a \$682 million increase over fiscal year 1991, but \$115 million less than the President's request.

The bill provides for \$4.5 billion in fiscal year 1992 for planning, construction, operation and maintenance and other activities relating to water projects, reflecting an increase of \$119 million more than the amount requested by the administration, and \$229 million more than last year's appropriation. The total includes \$3.6 billion for the Corps of Engineers, and \$887 million for the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

Regrettably, Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, in order to stay within the spending caps set in last year's budget bill, was unable to provide for any new starts for the construction of water projects many of us need in our districts in the coming fiscal year. The bill does continue to fund ongoing corps' construction projects, some of which are located in West Virginia, my home State. Among the West Virginia programs to receive continuing funding next year are:

East Lynn Lake, WV (flood control)	\$48,400,000
Gallipolis Locks and Dam, WV & OH (Nav.)	38,000,000
Levisa and Tug Forks and Upper Cumberland River, WV (flood control)	33,700,000
Winfield Lock and Dam, WV (Nav.)	15,000,000
For Corps of Engineers investigations and planning projects, the following will be continued in fiscal year 1992 at locations in West Virginia:	
Cabin Creek LPP, WV (Planning grant)	\$135,000
Island Creek at Logan, WV (Planning) ..	370,000
Kanawha River Navig. Study (Investig.) ..	995,000
Moorefield, WV (Planning)	950,000
Petersburg, WV (Planning)	550,000
WV Comp Study, WV (Ohio River MI40-317)	124,000

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the subcommittee has rejected the administration's proposal to phase out sections 14, 103, 107, 111, and 208 of the Corps of Engineers' Continuing Authorities Program. These programs have, and will continue to, be of great value and are particularly important in provid-

ing assistance to many small communities throughout the Nation. West Virginia, a State made up entirely of small communities, stands to benefit from these continuing authorities. For example, under section 14, with corps' authority to fund projects in the public interest in emergency-type circumstances, the stream-bank erosion and flooding damage that occurred to the Barboursville Sewage Lagoon, in Barboursville, WV, could be addressed. The Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, has determined after site visits that one more high water event and the sewage lagoon will be breached, endangering the sewage treatment facility. They have recommended that bank protection and reconstruction of the distressed segment of the sheet pile wall and failed embankment be provided, and have indicated that if section 14 continuing authority funding remains available, the Barboursville project may be addressed. This is critical to the health and well-being of the residents of Barboursville, WV, in my Fourth Congressional District.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee's rejection of the administration's proposal to phase out section 14's continuing authority is much appreciated by me, and I am confident by other Members with similar problems in their congressional districts.

Under "Operations and Maintenance," the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill includes funding for Corps of Engineers operation and maintenance of certain programs, the following which are located in West Virginia:

Beech Fork Lake, WV	\$839,000
Bluestone Lake, WV	1,529,000
Burnsville Lake, WV	1,171,000
East Lynn Lake, WV	1,132,000
Elk River Harbor, WV	1,000
Elkins, WV	5,000
Kanawha River locks and dams, WV	8,534,000
Ohio River locks and dams, Huntington, WV	14,333,000
Ohio River open channel work, Huntington, WV	1,764,000
R.D. Bailey Lake, WV	1,186,000
Stonewall Jackson Lake, WV	865,000
Summersville, Lake, WV	1,168,000
Sutton Lake, WV	1,602,000
Tygart Lake, WV	1,139,000

Mr. Chairman, one of the long-standing efforts of mine throughout my 15 years in the House of Representatives has been to support, protect, preserve, reauthorize, and seek funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC]. West Virginia is the only one out of 13 Appalachian States that lies totally within Appalachia. Appalachia is made up of 398 counties located in 13 States, and is known and well-documented as the poverty pocket of the richest Nation in the world.

In 1960, John F. Kennedy discovered Appalachia while campaigning in West Virginia for the Presidency. He never forgot. He created the Appalachian Regional Commission, and pledged to bring those 20 million Americans into the 20th century. If he had lived, it would have happened. As of now, Appalachia not only is still struggling to enter the 20th century, but without our continued strong support, will not be able to enter the 21st century, a scant 9 years away.

While filled with gratitude that the ARC is level funded this year at \$170 million—the same as last year—I am regretful too. I am re-

gretful because for 8 years under Reagan's administration, it took all of us working together to save the ARC from being terminated. Throughout his years in Washington, President Reagan zeroed out the ARC Program in each of his budgets.

President Bush asked for only \$50 million last year, but Congress provided \$170 million. This year, President Bush requested \$100 million, still reflecting a dramatic cutback in ARC funding. Again, the House is rejecting that cut and funding ARC at last year's level. As I have said, I am grateful for level-funding, but regretful that it could not have been more.

As the subcommittee has found, economic and community development programs, such as ARC, in disadvantaged areas of the country are necessary. They have served their purpose in the past, meeting local needs. The continuation of the ARC serves the national interests. There is such a great remaining need in Appalachia—that the Federal/State co-operation is meaningless unless we give it meaningful funding. There are roads to be built, health care and educational facilities needed for the medically indigent and the educationally disadvantaged.

It has been 25 years and more since the ARC was conceived by President Kennedy, and carried forward by President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs in his war on poverty. From the beginning it was intended, as the subcommittee report states, to equalize the region with the rest of the country. Yet today, despite the efforts of many, Appalachia remains cut off from the rest of the world—few roads out—little access to the rest of the States in which 398 counties are located, and severely limited access to the rest of the United States.

I thank the chairman for his understanding and support of Appalachia's needs, and for the level funding of \$170 million in these times of budgetary constraints. I thank him for turning elsewhere when he and his colleagues looked for ways in which to cut funding in order to stay within the spending caps set last year.

I take this opportunity to thank and commend Chairman TOM BEVILL for his commitment to bringing a bill to the floor that does, to the extent possible, and under extraordinary budgetary conditions, preserve and protect the programs that are so essential to the well-being of a nation. These programs, water resources and development, ARC, and reclamation projects, are critical to communities large and small. The funding contained in H.R. 2427 will bring all of us one step closer to economic parity by helping create and maintain viable tax bases, private sector support systems, and essential public services in our 435 congressional districts that make up the 50 States and territories.

I strongly support passage of H.R. 2427, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the bill to make appropriations available in fiscal year 1992 for energy and water development projects.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I am adamantly opposed to a proposal that the Department of Defense dropped on Congress on May 24 to reorganize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE]. The reorganization plan is misguided, unfair, and based on inappropriate cri-

teria. It appears to be an attempt by the Army to subvert and limit the civilian public works functions of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Glossing over Pentagon spending is nothing new and in the proposal advanced under the guise of reorganization and consolidation, the important civilian role of the Corps of Engineers is slashed in an effort to spare the military budget. In the process, vital public works and environmental protection responsibilities will be dumped in the lap of other Federal agencies that are already overloaded or State and local governments without any funding to help fulfill those roles.

USACE report boldly claims that people are the most important asset to the USACE, but they are treated as an afterthought in this process. The report recommends the elimination of 2,600 USACE employees. The most important resource rhetoric rings hollow for the professional corps employee who is left without a job. While the report estimates total costs of \$266 million to implement the reorganization plan with an annual savings of \$112 million after implementation, there is no independent verification available for either of these figures. It is worth noting that savings in and of itself may not be a wise idea where we are talking about the abandonment of environmental management and protection activities. Of course, the Corps of Engineers will save money if it simply dumps its responsibilities elsewhere with the layoff of 2,600 workers. We could save billions in defense spending if we abolished a branch of the Department of Defense, but that would certainly not be a wise or prudent course of action.

It is entirely inappropriate to evaluate the merits of the corps based on the national security criteria for military base closings. The base closing criteria were intended to respond to changing defense needs. The need to control floods, protect wetlands, and navigable waterways has little to do with the criteria designed to guide military base closings and realignments.

Mr. Chairman, on April 12, Secretary of Defense Cheney decided not to follow the recommendation of the Army to include the reorganization of the Corps of Engineers under the base realignment and closure process known as BRAC-91. Secretary Cheney recognized at that time that there is overlapping congressional jurisdiction between the Armed Services Committee and the Public Works Committee as well as the Appropriations Committee. The Secretary assured us that he would be working with these committees and the Congress on this matter. Instead, the Corps of Engineers reorganization plan was presented to Congress after the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee Report for fiscal year 1992 was already written and without hearings by the committee of jurisdiction prior to its being advanced as an official Department of Defense position.

I am very concerned that if Congress were to permit this reorganization process to go forward without the careful scrutiny which it demands that we will be going down a blind alley with unforeseen consequences for the environment as well as civil works projects. Military construction has decreased significantly in recent years while the proportion of civil works projects and environmental management ac-

tivities have increased. As an example, well over 90 percent of the work of the St. Paul District Office of the Corps involves civil works and environmental management activities.

The management of inland waters, including wetlands, is vital in the Upper Midwest region. The St. Paul District Office has done an excellent job in fulfilling its responsibilities in this area. There is certainly no assurance that such performance would continue to occur if the USACE proceeds under this submitted reorganization plan.

The need to control floods, protect wetlands, and maintain navigable waterways are increasing in importance; not declining. This proposal does not face up to the realities of today. Environmental and transportation problems are on the rise while the need for a military buildup is on the decline. This reorganization plan would have us believe the opposite is true.

The Army is either totally out of touch with reality or more likely desperately trying to protect its military budget activities while sacrificing its civilian role. I plan to continue working closely with my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, Mr. ROBERT ROE, to ensure that Congress thoroughly scrutinizes this plan.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427. I would like to address, in particular, provisions for the Auburn Folsom South Unit of the Central Valley project in California. Although I am pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee has provided to the Bureau of Reclamation \$900,000 for the second year of a 5-year, \$4,700,000 cost-shared feasibility study of water and power development at a multipurpose Auburn Dam, I am somewhat disappointed that the original \$1,500,000 was not appropriated to keep the study on course for its projected completion date.

I am fearful of a repeat of the 1986 flood which the Sacramento area experienced if the construction of the multipurpose Auburn Dam is not expedited. In 1986, the American River Basin experienced a serious flood which resulted in disaster for the area. The runoff was too great for the levy banks to contain the water, and parts of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties were submerged. This included the major interstate which links the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, effectively cutting off group transportation through the area for many days.

With the rains of the March miracle, California's reservoirs have experienced some relief. In the fifth straight year of drought, however, the combination of arid soil and rains has accelerated the natural erosion process which occurs with the levy banks. Thus, the threat of flooding once again has increased significantly in certain areas.

Ironically, a solution to much of the area's recurring flood and drought problems was authorized by Congress in 1965: the Auburn Dam project. With the twin threats of drought and flood looming over my constituents, it is clear that the construction of the multipurpose Auburn Dam is a vital part of the solution to these dangers which threaten the citizens of northern California. The multipurpose Auburn Dam will provide the necessary flood control

and water storage needed. I strongly support it. Had the 1986 flood waters been captured and stored in a multipurpose dam, the impact of the last 5 years of drought would have been greatly diminished.

Despite this need for more water, there are some, particularly in the Sacramento area, who favor a flood control-only project, a so-called dry dam. A dry dam—even an expandable one—would provide flood control benefits for Sacramento but would not store needed water for Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties. I oppose this alternative and continue to support a multipurpose Auburn Dam to provide for all of the many water, power, recreation, and fisheries needs for the area.

This past November on the general election ballot, the citizens of Sacramento County realized the necessity of the multipurpose Auburn Dam and decisively approved Measure "T" by 58.7 percent of the vote. Measure "T" requires the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors to actively pursue the multipurpose Auburn Dam.

For years, opponents of the multipurpose Auburn Dam have pointed to the lack of non-Federal cost sharing partners as evidence that the project was not economical. These opponents have argued that if we truly needed a multipurpose Auburn Dam somebody would step forward to help fund it. I am pleased to say that interested non-Federal parties have stepped forward. The American River Authority [ARA], a joint entity made up of officials from El Dorado and Placer Counties and local water districts, the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority and the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors have all officially declared their intent to finance the water portions of the project and to purchase the water.

The actions of these prospective non-Federal cost-sharing partners are irrefutable evidence that this project is both sorely needed and economically viable. Their actions have served to expand the base of local support for the project and rejuvenate the enthusiasm of many longtime supporters. It has sparked renewed interest on the part of the Interior Department to negotiate a Federal/non-Federal partnership which is fiscally realistic in these days of tight Federal dollars.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate to support H.R. 2427, and the construction of the multipurpose Auburn Dam.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992, and to commend and congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama; the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana; the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]; and the members of the committee and their staffs, for their diligence in bringing this bill to the floor—once again, the first appropriations bill to reach the floor—and equally important, bringing it in under the budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are many demands upon the Federal budget, all of them important in their own right, and it is a difficult job to respond to those demands while keeping within the constraints of the budget resolution. As usual, the committee has done an outstanding job, and I want to express my personal

thanks, as well as the thanks of the citizens of the 19th District of California, for the inclusion in this bill of funding for a number of vital, ongoing flood control and navigation projects in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties.

All of us can rest easier knowing that these critical safety and infrastructure needs are being addressed, for they are the foundation for our economy and public safety, and we are grateful.

I urge an "aye" vote on the bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1992 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

And, I want to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly Chairman BEVILL and the ranking member, JOHN MYERS, for their continuing help and support with respect to the central Arizona project [CAP].

Their firm support over the years has finally transformed the CAP from the drawing boards to reality, delivering more than 1 million acre-feet of water this year. With the project finally nearing completion, the funding request is lower than in previous years and the focus is beginning to change from construction to effective management, water conservation and delivery. I am pleased that the funding level recommended in the fiscal year 1992 bill will keep this project—which will really deliver central and southern Arizona's life blood—on track toward early completion.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Chairman BEVILL and Mr. MYERS for their consideration of another funding request, for environmental mitigation of the Arizona Canal Diversion Channel. Although they were not able to accommodate the request in this bill because of very severe budget constraints, I do want to touch upon it for a moment and ask that the committee still keep an open mind in the event that a solution can be identified in the Senate.

The Arizona Canal Diversion Channel is an Army Corps of Engineers' flood control project intended to help protect portions of the metropolitan Phoenix area from another disaster like that which occurred in 1972, when an estimated 2,600 homes, 15 apartment complexes, and numerous commercial properties were damaged by extensive flooding. It is a project that has been authorized and funded for some time.

The problem is, construction of the new flood control channel is finally about to begin in some very unique and scenic areas of Phoenix and Paradise Valley—areas that are also used extensively by residents for recreational purposes. Not only will those areas be compromised by the channel's construction, but the recreational uses will also be displaced. Moreover, most of the flood control benefits would not accrue to the neighborhoods bearing the brunt of construction, but to the neighborhoods south of the channel in the city of Phoenix.

In an effort to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts, I've been working with area residents, the local governments, and the corps to develop an alternative design, to be cost-shared by the city of Phoenix and the town of Paradise Valley, to cover certain portions of the channel. The alternative design would accommodate landscaping, as well as enough additional structural strength to sup-

port maintenance vehicles and pedestrian traffic.

Were the budget climate different this year, I think the alternative would have merited the committee's support. But, as I said, Mr. Chairman, the committee was unable to accommodate this request because of budgetary constraints. I believe the committee turned down virtually all requests for new funding.

I do want to tell the chairman, however, that I appreciate the serious consideration that was given, and, in the event that the issue can be addressed in the Senate, I would just ask that the committee keep an open mind.

I look forward to working with the committee on this and other issues. And, again, I rise in strong support of the bill.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to make some observations about the inadequate funding for the Garrison diversion project contained in the energy and water appropriations bill. At the outset, may I observe that the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee has always cooperated with me and the State of North Dakota regarding funding for Garrison diversion and other water projects. This time, however, the budget agreement simply took away the subcommittee's ability to transfer funds among various accounts.

THE FIRST STEP

As a result, the subcommittee used the budget request as the Garrison funding level. For the first time in several years, the administration did submit a budget with some significant funding for the Garrison project. That's an important first step in the right direction and it represents the fruit of an effort initiated by the North Dakota delegation to try to rebuild the consensus which produced the Garrison Reformulation Act.

However, the \$25 million budget request, which prohibits money for irrigation activities, still does not respond adequately to the critical water needs of North Dakota nor does it fully keep the Federal commitment to our State.

A MEANINGFUL BUDGET

I would respectfully tell my colleagues that we should be supporting a Garrison budget similar to that which the Governor of North Dakota presented to the Appropriations Committee on behalf of our State. Let me briefly outline what a budget of about \$45 million would do.

It would principally provide \$26 million for State municipal, rural, and industrial [MR&I] water projects, including priority funding for the southwest pipeline which I will discuss momentarily. It would include \$4.5 million to complete the critically needed MR&I projects on Indian reservations, which have some of the worst water supplies in the Nation. It would also allow for further progress on completing irrigation facilities on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation. It would further support a vigorous, \$5 million wildlife enhancement program and a \$2 million wetland trust fund, a pioneering effort which is unique in the entire Nation. Finally, a \$45 million budget would permit modest progress on recreational features of the Garrison project.

PROBLEMS WITH THE BUDGET REQUEST

Accepting the budget request, as I suggested, would produce some serious problems for our State.

First, at a rate of \$25 million annually, it will take 35 years—until the year 2025—to complete the Garrison project. But this time, most people who have suffered the impact of having prime farmland inundated by the Garrison Dam will have gone on to meet their maker. It's simply unacceptable for the people of North Dakota to wait more than 60 years—from when the dam was built—to see the promise of water development fulfilled.

Second, it would break faith with the people of North Dakota to eliminate irrigation from the project. The administration request assumes that no funding for fiscal year 1992—or any future funding—could be used to build irrigation features as part of the Garrison diversion project. This would severely limit the project and remove the main capability for water development on which the people of my State have been counting for over 25 years.

Third, the administration appears not to understand that this takes away the very buffer against drought which States all across the West are realizing that they need to assure the delivery of reliable water supplies. It also fails to realize that the same canals needed for irrigation are the ones which would deliver water for municipal uses in the Red River Valley and stabilize Devils Lake for recreational and wildlife purposes.

IMMEDIATE WATER NEEDS

Accepting the administration's request would also be wrong because it would fail to recognize North Dakota's immediate MR&I water requirements. Even if you conceded the administration's argument on irrigation—which I have already shown to be fundamentally flawed—\$25 million does not begin to address the current nonirrigation needs in the State.

The Environmental Protection Agency has already declared that six southwestern communities in the State do not comply with safe drinking water standards. They have been notified that \$25,000 per day fines will be imposed unless these towns can deliver safer water. But these communities cannot drill wells to tap a new water supply. There is no such resource. Their only hope is to link up with the Garrison-funded southwest pipeline, which must be put on a funding fast track of about \$15 million for each of the next 2 years in order to deal with these EPA problems.

I am also concerned that Congress must continue to be an active partner in the process of completing the Garrison diversion project. I recently received a letter from the Department of Interior's Assistant Secretary for Water and Science. It confirmed the budget request and stated that certain Interior task force recommendations on Garrison were "consistent with Presidential policy and direction." Unfortunately, that completely ignores the judgment of Congress in writing the Garrison Reformulation Act.

It also abrogates the pledge of President Reagan, who signed that act with his full support and wrote me:

I am confident that this measure addresses the water needs of your state, while maintaining a fiscal integrity consistent with my administration's efforts to ensure that only cost-effective projects are constructed.

President Reagan told me that the Reformulation Act passed the test. He understood that the people of North Dakota made a great sac-

rifice in cutting the project in half. Now this administration seems to be backing away from that commitment.

If you find this puzzling and disturbing, so do I. I believe that Congress must stick with the right choice for Garrison, such as I outlined before.

In a word, I am concerned that the administration's request and the funding in this bill would close off the opportunities for irrigation in a semiarid State, retard wildlife enhancement, shortchange essential MR&I projects, and drag out water development for all of our people, including the Indian tribes. That's unacceptable and it's wrong.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to support a higher funding level for Garrison in conference, if the Senate acts to increase this account. I know that the Appropriations Committee has sought to do the best it can, but I ask that you make the right response and fund Garrison diversion at a level which keeps faith with North Dakota and which helps us to meet our present and future needs for water development.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, the 1992 energy and water development appropriations bill. In particular, I am pleased that the committee's bill includes \$300,000 that I had requested to begin a feasibility study of the Manasquan River in New Jersey.

In both 1987 and 1989, heavy rains forced the Manasquan River to overflow its banks and caused severe damages in Howell Township, Freehold Township, and other New Jersey communities. In June 1989, both Howell and Freehold declared states of emergency in order to clear streams of debris and sediment. These measures, while helpful in the short term, will not resolve the long-term flooding potential.

In March 1990, at a meeting with local officials and representatives of the corps, it was determined that a study needed to be conducted to identify the most comprehensive and effective way to prevent future flooding events. Subsequently, I introduced legislation, H.R. 4778, to authorize the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of implementing flood control measures on the Manasquan River to alleviate flooding in Howell, Freehold, and other affected municipalities in New Jersey. This legislation was included as part of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, which became Public Law 101-640.

Mr. Chairman, last year I requested that \$300,000 be included in the 1991 energy and water development appropriations bill to begin this feasibility study. The subcommittee accommodated my request and included the money in the House bill, H.R. 5019. Unfortunately, the Senate did not approve similar funding. This year, I testified before the subcommittee on April 10 and renewed my request for these funds. Given the large number of requests for flood control projects that are made each year, I am pleased that the subcommittee agreed with me and included the money in the 1992 appropriations bill.

I would like to thank Mr. BEVILL and Mr. MYERS, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as

Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. MCDADE, the chairman and ranking minority member of the full Appropriations Committee, for their assistance in securing this funding. I also want to thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, a member of the subcommittee, for his help in this matter.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, as a supporter of H.R. 2427, the energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a project contained in the bill that is of great importance to the people of Broward County, FL.

The project to which I refer is the dredging of Hillsboro Inlet, located in my congressional district. The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee included a \$150,000 appropriation to begin the long overdue work on Hillsboro Inlet.

As my colleagues might recall, for fiscal year 1990 the House agreed to a \$50,000 appropriation, but that sum was later dropped in conference committee. For fiscal year 1989, the House agreed to a \$100,000 appropriation and bill language directing the Army Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete an economic reevaluation of the Hillsboro Inlet feature. Unfortunately, this appropriation was later deleted, also in conference committee. Because of a lack of funding, this project was deauthorized on December 31, 1989, under the provisions of section 1001 of Public Law 99-662. However, members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, especially Chairman NOWAK, recognized the importance of this project and included it as part of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990. Hence, the authorization of this project continues.

This project was originally authorized as part of the Broward County Beach Erosion Control and Hillsboro Inlet Navigation Program, which was passed by Congress in 1965. The original project was extensive and costly. After examining all the options, local officials decided not to proceed with the program and instead the Hillsboro Inlet Improvement and Maintenance District purchased a dredge and has been keeping the inlet clear for the past 24 years. The Army Corps of Engineers therefore categorized the project as inactive and shelved further construction plans.

Unfortunately, the forces of nature and economic development have recently overtaken the abilities of the local community. A large sandbar has built up across the mouth of the inlet, beyond the range of the local dredge. This shoaling up of the inlet creates treacherous, often impossible, navigation hazards and prevents a proper flow of water through the inlet. Present conditions needlessly endanger recreational boaters who are not familiar with conditions around the mouth of the inlet, and discourages commercial use of the inlet by charter boats, long-line fishing vessels and other marine enterprises. Perhaps most importantly, the sandbar prevents the inlet from properly serving as a flush-out point and floodgate for the communities to the west of Hillsboro.

In December 1990, a member of my Washington office staff, with Frank Rysavy, chairman of the Hillsboro Inlet Commission, and George Strain, a member of the Army Corps from the Jacksonville district, toured the inlet.

What my staff member reported back to me was distressing. During the hour they were there, they witnessed two near collisions, one involving a Coast Guard cutter. These reports confirmed my own fears that unless action is taken soon, a serious accident due to unsafe conditions in the inlet is waiting to happen.

The flood control properties of the inlet were not considered in the originally authorized project. At the time the area west of Hillsboro was sparsely populated and the periodic flooding which occurred caused little concern. Since that time, there has been explosive population growth in Broward County. Flooding in this area would not cause severe economic damage as well as endanger the lives and safety of the people in the area, many of whom are elderly and would not be able to evacuate quickly.

The dredge which the Hillsboro Authority owns and operates is not certified for operation in the open ocean and would be prone to capsizing if the attempt were made to utilize it outside the sheltered waters of the inlet. Accordingly, the Hillsboro Inlet Authority contacted the corps to see what assistance might be available.

Obviously, this project is more crucial than ever. Because of the urgency to begin work now on Hillsboro Inlet is readily apparent, I will be working hard to ensure that this appropriation does not suffer the same fate its predecessors did in conference committee. I applaud Chairman BEVILL and Representative MYERS for their foresight and assistance in this matter, and hope this project will continue to enjoy their support in the conference committee.

While I am glad that the Appropriations Committee included Hillsboro Inlet as part of H.R. 2427, I am intensely disappointed, as I am sure most of the members of the Florida delegation are, that funding for construction of a melaleuca biocontrol quarantine facility was not included in the bill. I am aware that for only the second time in two decades, the committee did not include funding for new projects. Also, I am cognizant that H.R. 2427 appropriates a sum of \$114.8 million below the President's request. I commend the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, under the able leadership of Representative TOM BEVILL, for reporting a bill that is fiscally prudent in these days of huge budget deficits. However, I am hopeful that perhaps the subcommittee will see fit to include the melaleuca biocontrol project in the fiscal year 1993. Every year we wait, we lose more precious acres of Florida Everglades to the insidious pest melaleuca.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, the energy and water appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This bill provides much needed resources to programs that develop technologies vital for our energy security.

Earlier this year the administration recognized the importance of energy policy by calling for enactment of a national energy strategy. Despite this call to action, the administration's overall budget request would have actually lowered civilian energy programs for fiscal year 1992 by over 5 percent below the fiscal year 1991 level.

In response to the inadequate support for energy programs proposed by the administration, Congress recently passed a budget resolution setting forth ambitious funding targets with balanced priorities. Understanding the need to control the deficit, the budget resolution provided this funding while obeying the restrictions laid down by last year's bipartisan budget agreement.

This appropriations bill further responds to the challenge of forming a national energy policy by following the general blueprint contained in the budget resolution. The Appropriations Committee is to be strongly commended for exercising critical leadership in this area.

I am especially glad to note the increases provided in this bill for solar and other renewable technologies. Overall, these accounts would rise from \$198 million in fiscal year 1991 to \$230 million in fiscal year 1992. This increase would make a substantial downpayment toward expanding these programs.

Renewable sources of energy are vital to our Nation's future, offering opportunities to supply our energy needs in ways that are safe, affordable, clean and secure. Examples of some of the most promising technologies include photovoltaics systems, solar thermal engines, and advanced wind turbines, all of which have received greater support under this bill. A continued commitment will be required to ensure their commercialization.

In addition, I would like to stress the importance of completing our response to the call for a national energy strategy. Later this year, I hope that Congress will consider and pass authorizing legislation providing comprehensive direction for the future.

In the meanwhile, this bill points in the right direction for U.S. energy policy. Therefore, I give it my full support and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2427, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1992.

At the outset, I want to commend Appropriations Committee Chairman JAMIE WHITTEN, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development Appropriations Chairman TOM BEVILL, and my friend and colleague from California, VIC FAZIO, and their respective staffs, for all their fine work on this important legislation.

Of particular interest to me are those provisions of the bill that impact my congressional district.

There continues to be an urgent need for navigation and related improvements at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Cargo demands through these ports continues to grow beyond previous projections, and the need for new channels and additional terminals are immediate to accommodate this growth. Both ports are in the process of negotiating with clients for new terminals, and some time will be needed for constructing the necessary navigation improvements and for terminal development. It is essential to the Nation that these facilities be available to meet this demand. The Corps of Engineers' Los Angeles District Office has completed a draft feasibility report, which presents a plan for navigation improvements and creation of about 800 acres of landfill, generally consistent with that authorized in the 1986 Water Resources

Development Act. This legislation includes \$42 million to initiate final design of the plan. I strongly support this provision.

The existing physical model at the Vicksburg, MS, Waterway Experiment Station, with the recently completed model enhancement program to upgrade the model to current state of the art, has been a valuable tool in the planning of navigation and terminal plans for the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. This model will continue to be essential in the final design of Federal and port plans for navigation and related improvements. This legislation includes \$841,000 to not only maintain the model, but also allow for the collection of additional wave data and water quality analysis. I strongly support this item.

Another major interest I have is with the Los Angeles County drainage area flood control review study. There are 22 cities affected by flood conditions in the drainage area that are very concerned with completing this study to protect existing property. These areas are also impacted by new FEMA maps on existing and new development. With this in mind, I also strongly support the \$3 million earmark in the bill for the planning, engineering and design phase of this project.

Lastly, I want to thank the committee for including \$200,000 in the bill to continue to study the Federal interest in shore protection measures as part of solving the landslide problem at Rancho Palos Verdes. Although this project is in DANA ROHRBACHER's district, I want to express my strong support for it and also urge the corps to quickly move into the cost-shared feasibility phase of the study to help solve a problem that has and continues to cause millions of dollars of damage to the shoreline.

Again, thank you Chairman, WHITTEN and Chairman BEVILL for all your help on these matters. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 2427.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for superconducting super collider. It is conceivably one of the most ambitious physics projects to date and promises to open the door to unprecedented scientific discoveries. These discoveries will allow this country to develop better technological solutions to many of the problems we face today. It will lead to advances in the fields of medicine, electronics, and fiber-optics, just to name a few.

Another benefit of the super collider, and one that I think is especially important, is that it will inspire a new generation of scientists. The SSC is more than an atomsmasher, it is a great laboratory for high-energy physics. A project of this magnitude will certainly capture the interest and imagination of the young people in this country and around the world. I am convinced it will encourage many of them to become scientists in the future, much like the Apollo missions did for the last generation.

Mr. Chairman, the SSC is important not only for the scientific discoveries it will reveal, but it is also necessary for the health and vitality of the scientific profession. The SSC is an integral element in this Nation's commitment to technological, scientific, and educational leadership.

Mr. MEYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for

time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$200,566,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That with funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake the following items under General Investigations in fiscal year 1992 in the amounts specified:

Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas, \$500,000;

Casino Beach, Illinois, \$375,000;

Chicago Shoreline, Illinois, \$325,000;

Illinois Waterway Navigation Study, Illinois, \$2,185,000;

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, \$3,000,000;

Miami River Sediments, Florida, \$200,000;

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$330,000;

Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, \$370,000;

St. Louis Harbor, Missouri and Illinois, \$900,000;

Fort Fisher and Vicinity, North Carolina, \$250,000;

Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey, \$7,150,000, of which \$400,000 shall be used to initiate the General Design Memorandum for the Streambank Restoration Project, West Bank of the Passaic River, as authorized by section 101(a)(18)(B) of Public Law 101-640;

Buffalo Small Boat Harbor, New York, \$70,000;

Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas, \$3,200,000; and

La Conner, Washington, \$60,000;

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized, in partnership with the Department of Transportation, and in coordination with other Federal agencies, including the Department of Energy, to conduct research and development associated with an advanced high speed magnetic levitation transportation system: *Provided further*, That in carrying out the flood control study for Calleguas Creek, California, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to consider

the benefits resulting from a change in cropping patterns to more capital-intensive crops within the floodplain: *Provided further*, That using \$425,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to complete a reconnaissance report and initiate a feasibility phase study of the bank stabilization problems at Norco Bluffs, California, as authorized by section 116(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate and complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Miami River, Florida, sediments project, to include the full dredging of all polluted bottom sediments from the Seybold Canal and the Miami River between the mouth of the river and the salinity control structure at 36th Street, and the disposal of the polluted sediments in an environmentally sound manner, in compliance with Public Law 99-662, using funds appropriated for that purpose in this Act and the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, Public Law 101-514: *Provided further*, That using \$200,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to undertake the development of a comprehensive waterfront plan for the White River in central Indianapolis, Indiana: *Provided further*, That with \$425,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Olcott Harbor, New York, project, including all activities necessary to ready the project for construction as authorized by Public Law 99-662: *Provided further*, That with \$700,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to create, in cooperation with the National Park Service and other agencies as appropriate, a comprehensive river corridor greenway plan for the Lackawanna River Basin, Pennsylvania: *Provided further*, That with \$120,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to undertake a study, in cooperation with the Port of Walla Walla, Washington, of the disposition of the current Walla Walla District headquarters: *Provided further*, That using \$1,100,000 of the funds appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, Public Law 101-514, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to complete the South Atlantic Cargo Traffic study authorized by section 116(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 at full Federal expense in accordance with existing law.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), \$1,191,310,000, of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99-662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That with funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the

Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake the following projects in fiscal year 1992 in the amounts specified:

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana, \$5,800,000;
O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, \$4,000,000;
Kissimmee River, Florida, \$5,000,000;
Red River Below Denison Dam, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, \$2,300,000;
New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, \$2,500,000; and
Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$3,000,000;

Provided further, That with \$20,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue the work for the levees/floodwalls and to undertake other structural and nonstructural work associated with the Barboursville, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367 and to continue the work for the river diversion tunnels and to undertake other structural and nonstructural work associated with the Harlan, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367: *Provided further*, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of the Barboursville, Kentucky, and Harlan, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project: *Provided further*, That using \$44,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue the planning, engineering, design and construction of projects under the sections 14, 103, 107, 111, 205 and 208 Continuing Authorities Programs: *Provided further*, That using \$600,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Salyersville cut-through as authorized by Public Law 99-662, section 401(e)(1), in accordance with the Special Project Report for Salyersville, Kentucky, concurred in by the Ohio River Division Engineer on or about July 26, 1989: *Provided further*, That with \$750,000 of the funds appropriated herein, or funds hereafter provided in subsequent annual appropriations Acts, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to award continuing contracts until construction is complete in accordance with the terms and conditions of Public Law 100-202 for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt project in Iowa: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall expend \$300,000 of the funds appropriated herein in fiscal year 1992 on plans and specifications, environmental documentation and hydraulic modeling to advance to the maximum extent practicable the project to restore the riverbed gradient at Mile 206 of the Sacramento River in California: *Provided further*, That with funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct the project for shoreline protection at Emeryville Point Park Marina, California, under the authority of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended, at a total estimated first cost of \$1,396,000 with an estimated first Federal cost of \$907,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of \$489,000, in accordance

with the plan recommended by the Division Commander in the report entitled Detailed Project Report, section 103, Shoreline Protection Project, Emeryville Point Park Marina dated November 1988. The cost sharing for this project shall be in accordance with the provisions of title I, section 103, of Public Law 99-662 for hurricane and storm damage reduction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct the San Timoteo feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem flood control project by scheduling design and construction. The Secretary is further directed to initiate and complete design and to fund and award all construction contracts necessary for completion of the San Timoteo feature. Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate the design: *Provided further*, That using \$1,252,000 previously appropriated for the Hansen Dam, California, project, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to plan, design and construct a swim lake and associated recreational facilities at Hansen Dam as described in the February 1991 Hansen Dam Master Plan prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to pursue the completion of the Ouachita-Black Rivers Navigation Project in Louisiana and Arkansas, including construction of the required cutoffs and bendway widenings in Louisiana. The Federal Government is authorized to advance rights-of-way acquisition for the cutoffs and bendway widenings at Federal expense, and the State of Louisiana shall have 10 years after construction begins to repay its portion of the costs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall include as project costs in accordance with the Post Authorization Change Report, dated April 1989, as revised in January 1990, the costs for aesthetics for the Brush Creek, Kansas City, Missouri, project, which shall be shared with non-Federal interests under the provisions of section 103(a) of Public Law 99-662: *Provided further*, That with funds heretofore, herein or hereafter appropriated, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to award continuing contracts until construction is complete in accordance with the terms and conditions of Public Law 101-101 for the O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, and Wallisville Lake, Texas, projects: *Provided further*, That with funds appropriated herein and hereafter for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana Hurricane Protection project, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to provide parallel hurricane protection along the entire lengths of the Orleans Avenue and London Avenue Outfall Canals by raising levees and improving flood protection works along and parallel to the entire lengths of the outfall canals and other pertinent work necessary to complete an entire parallel protection system, to be cost shared as an authorized project feature, the Federal cost participation in which shall be 70 percent of the total cost of the entire parallel protection system, and the local cost participation in which shall be 30 percent of the total cost of such entire parallel protection system: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct project modifications for improvement of the environment, as part of the Anacostia River Flood Control and Navi-

gation project, District of Columbia and Maryland, within Prince Georges County, Maryland, using \$700,000 of the funds appropriated herein, under the authority of section 1135 of Public Law 99-662, as amended; and, in addition, \$73,681,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for construction of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$353,437,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$250,000 shall be available for bank stabilization measures as determined by the Chief of Engineers to be advisable for the control of bank erosion of streams in the Yazoo Basin, including the foothill area, and where necessary such measures shall complement similar works planned and constructed by the Soil Conservation Service and be limited to the areas of responsibility mutually agreeable to the District Engineer and the State Conservationist: *Provided further*, That the funds provided herein for operation and maintenance of Yazoo Basin Lakes shall be available for the maintenance of road and trail surfaces, alignments, widths, and drainage features: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$420,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue preconstruction engineering and design studies on the Eastern Arkansas Region Comprehensive Study, Arkansas.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation, \$1,547,855,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, may be derived from that fund, and of which \$15,000,000 shall be for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities, to be derived from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 shall be available for obligation for national emergency preparedness programs: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue the development of recreation facilities at Sepulveda Dam, California: *Provided further*, That using \$400,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to plan and design a fifteen-acre swim lake and related recreational facilities at Hansen Dam, California: *Provided further*, That using \$300,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers,

is directed to dredge approximately 1,000 feet of the Ohio River along the Ashland, Kentucky, riverfront: *Provided further*, That using \$1,800,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to undertake the one-time repair and rehabilitation of the Flint, Michigan, project in order to restore the project to original project dimensions: *Provided further*, That \$40,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue the project for removal of silt and aquatic growth at Sauk Lake, Minnesota: *Provided further*, That \$150,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, for the development of Gateway Park at the Lower Granite Lock and Dam project: *Provided further*, That with \$8,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed on a one-time basis, to maintain access to existing State recognized port facilities on the Columbia and Snake Rivers between Bonneville Dam and Lewiston, Idaho, at a depth commensurate with the main navigation channel: *Provided further*, That using \$3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct and maintain bank stabilization measures along the north bank of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet from mile 49.9 through mile 56.1: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$1,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein to undertake measures needed to alleviate bank erosion and related problems associated with reservoir releases along the Missouri River below Fort Peck Dam as authorized by section 33 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to allocate resources and take other steps necessary to complete an environmental impact statement and related documents by June of 1992 on a plan to reoperate Folsom Dam to provide greater flood control, using funds appropriated for that purpose in fiscal year 1991. This plan shall require a cost sharing agreement between local sponsors and the Secretary of the Interior based on the requirements of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, with the costs for foregone water and power sales to be computed on the basis of actual reductions in supply attributable to greater operations for flood control in that year.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, \$86,000,000, to remain available until expended.

REVOLVING FUND

None of the funds from the revolving fund established by the Act of July 27, 1953, chapter 245 (33 U.S.C. 576), may be used to reimburse other Department of Defense appropriations used to acquire Standard Army Automated Contracting System equipment for Corps of Engineers activities.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For expenses necessary for emergency flood control, hurricane, and shore protection activities, as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, as amended, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Engineer Automation Support Activity, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity and the Water Resources Support Center, \$142,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by section 4110 of title 5, United States Code, uniforms, and allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding section 1001(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, the project for navigation, Coosa River, Gadsden, Alabama, to Rome, Georgia, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, shall remain authorized to be carried out by the Secretary. The project described above shall not be authorized for construction after the last day of the 5-year period that begins on the date of enactment of this Act unless, during this period, funds have been obligated for construction (including planning and design) of the project.

SEC. 102. Public Law 99-88, 99 Stat. 293, 316, as modified by Public Law 99-349, 100 Stat. 710, 724, is amended by striking the last two sentences in the paragraph that authorizes acquisition of new buildings and appurtenant facilities for the U.S. Army Engineer District, Walla Walla, Washington.

SEC. 103. The non-Federal share of the costs of preconstruction engineering and design of any water resources project constructed by the Secretary shall not be required to be paid prior to commencement of physical construction of the project.

SEC. 104. Title III of Public Law 98-396 (98 Stat. 1369) is amended by inserting after section 303a the following new section:

"SEC. 303b. (1) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Port of Camas-Washougal two parcels of land containing a total of approximately 45 acres and being a portion of an 82 acre tract of land acquired under the provisions of section 303a above and which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

"(2) The conveyance authorized above shall be made in consideration of the fair market value of the land conveyed and shall be for any lawful purpose, including, without limitation, industrial, recreational and natural area development and the grantee may sell or otherwise dispose of such property without limitation.

"(3) The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army and the cost of such survey shall be borne by

the Port of Camas-Washougal. The Secretary shall bear the costs of environmental review and appraisal.

"(4) The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

"(5) The Secretary is also authorized to transfer, without monetary consideration, approximately 37 acres of predominantly wetlands comprising the remainder of the above mentioned 82 acre tract to the Department of the Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for inclusion in the Steigerwald Lake National Wildlife Refuge."

SEC. 105. The project for flood control, Guadalupe River, California, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662), and the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-101), is modified to direct the Secretary of the Army to construct the project in accordance with the General Design Memorandum, dated January 1991 of the Sacramento District Engineer, and in accordance with the percentages specified in section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, at a total cost of \$134,300,000, with a first Federal cost of \$67,300,000 and a first non-Federal cost of \$67,000,000, further, if, after enactment of this Act and prior to award of the first construction contract by the Corps of Engineers, non-Federal interests initiate construction of the plan recommended herein, the Secretary shall credit such work toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

SEC. 106. The present value of the capital costs to be prepaid by the city of Aberdeen, Washington, under the Wynoochee Lake project contract shall be \$4,952,158.

SEC. 107. The experimental water delivery program established under section 1302 of Public Law 98-181 is authorized to continue until the modifications to the Central and Southern Florida project authorized under section 104 of Public Law 101-229 are completed and implemented.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title I?

If not, are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWIFT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWIFT: Page 4, strike line 1 and all that follows through "transportation system:" on line 6.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have reached an accommodation with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking member, Mr. MYERS, under which my amendment will be accepted. I would like to express my appreciation and that of Mr. DINGELL for the co-

operation we have received from the subcommittee.

My amendment strikes from the bill language at the top of page 4 authorizing the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct research and development associated with an advanced high-speed magnetic levitation transportation system. This legislation in an appropriations bill is problematic because it contravenes an explicit compromise reached last year in the water resources reauthorization among two Senate committees and three House committees, including the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The water resources bill expressly provided that "no funds are authorized to be appropriated" for these purposes "for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1991." The inclusion of this prohibition was agreed to in the context of an understanding that in the 102d Congress we would work together with all authorizing committees interested in mag-lev to find a comprehensive, long-term, sensible approach to this issue.

I want to assure the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the members, that we have every intention of accomplishing that goal with legislation this year. The committees are working together toward that end. In light of the corps' involvement in the mag-lev program to this point, it may well be that further long-term participation by the corps will be authorized in such legislation.

To date, a significant number of steps have been taken in this direction. In 1988, Congress amended the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to effectively enable the Federal Railroad Administration to start safety research on high-speed systems.

Shortly thereafter, the national mag-lev initiative [NMI] was undertaken. This is a coordinated effort to conduct research on mag-lev technology development and commercial feasibility. The Departments of Transportation and Energy, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers, are all working together on this initiative toward the common goal of defining and facilitating a role for mag-lev in the United States.

In addition, I introduced legislation earlier this year with Representative DON RITTER of Pennsylvania, H.R. 1087, to enable the Federal Railroad Administration to continue its valuable work on NMI. As part of the Committee on Energy and Commerce consideration of this bill, our staff has organized an all-day symposium on high-speed ground transportation development on June 10. Some of the issues to be covered during this event include: short-term/long-term costs; the leapfrog approach versus off-the-shelf purchase of existing technology; the role of high speed ground transportation in our national energy and transportation policies; and options for financing high-speed

projects. Majority and minority staff from all interested authorizing committees in both the House and the other body will participate.

Last, I would just like to add that my subcommittee plans to hold hearings on this issue later this year. We hope to address the overall issue of HSR in as comprehensive a manner as possible.

With that in mind, my amendment leaves in place the \$8 million earmarked in the committee report for mag-lev R&D by the corps. Our understanding is that these funds will be made available upon the enactment of an appropriate authorization. However, inclusion of the authorizing language in the appropriations bill itself would interfere with the process of enacting such an authorization.

I want to express my thanks and appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MYERS, for working with us to achieve a mutually acceptable solution to this problem.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, to remain available until expended, \$13,789,000: *Provided*, That, of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That funds contributed by non-Federal entities for purposes similar to this appropriation shall be available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed as though specifically appropriated for said purposes, and such amounts shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction and rehabilitation of projects and parts thereof (including power transmission facilities for Bureau of Reclamation use) and for other related activities as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$553,209,000, of which \$85,093,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), and \$117,266,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized

by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended: *Provided*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation under this heading: *Provided further*, That funds contributed by non-Federal entities for purposes similar to this appropriation shall be available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed as though specifically appropriated for said purposes, and such funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit shall not be determined until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform with the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein approved shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any national monument: *Provided further*, That the funds contained in this Act for the Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota, shall be expended only in accordance with the provisions of the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-294): *Provided further*, That all costs of the safety of dams modification work at Coolidge Dam, San Carlos Irrigation Project, Arizona, performed under the authority of the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 506), as amended, are in addition to the amount authorized in section 5 of said Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to study or construct the Cliff Dam feature of the Central Arizona Project: *Provided further*, That Plan 6 features of the Central Arizona Project other than Cliff Dam, including (1) water rights and associated lands within the State of Arizona acquired by the Secretary of the Interior through purchase, lease, or exchange, for municipal and industrial purposes, not to exceed 30,000 acre feet; and, (2) such increments of flood control that may be found to be feasible by the Secretary of the Interior at Horseshoe and Bartlett Dams, in consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of the Army and using Corps of Engineers evaluation criteria, developed in conjunction with dam safety modifications and consistent with applicable environmental law, are hereby deemed to constitute a suitable alternative to Orme Dam within the meaning of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (82 Stat. 885; 43 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated herein, \$900,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior to complete the final design of the Shasta Dam, California, water release facilities for the purpose of selectively withdrawing water from Shasta Lake to control the temperature, turbidity, and dissolved oxygen content of water released from Shasta Dam.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and other

facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, to remain available until expended, \$258,685,000: *Provided*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund, and the amount for program activities which can be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1987 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a, as amended), may be derived from that fund: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, such amounts as may be required for replacement work on the Boulder Canyon Project which would require readvances to the Colorado River Dam Fund shall be readvances to the Colorado River Dam Fund pursuant to section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618d), and such readvances since October 1, 1984, and in the future shall bear interest at the rate determined pursuant to section 104(a)(5) of Public Law 98-381: *Provided further*, That funds advanced by water users for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same purpose and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and such advances shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That revenues in the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund shall be available for performing examination of existing structures on participating projects of the Colorado River Storage Project, the costs of which shall be nonreimbursable.

LOAN PROGRAM

For administrative expenses related to loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a-422i), \$890,000: *Provided*, That of the total sums appropriated, the amount of program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$53,745,000, of which \$800,000 shall remain available until expended, the total amount to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency fund", as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U.S.C. 502), as amended, to remain available until expended for the purposes specified in said Act, \$1,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For capital equipment and facilities, \$5,900,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Act of November 1, 1985, (43 U.S.C. 1472).

SPECIAL FUNDS (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund or special fee account are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391) or the Act of December 22, 1987 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a, as amended), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the head "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the reclamation fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 16 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payment of claims for damages to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiations and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, in total not to exceed \$500,000; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriations Act 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Acts of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) and June 27, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 469): *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses", amounts provided for plan formulation investigations under the head "General Investigations", and amounts provided for science and technology under the head "Construction Program".

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of 31 U.S.C. 1341.

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve

months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

None of the funds made available by this or any other Act shall be used by the Bureau of Reclamation for contracts for surveying and mapping services unless such contracts for which a solicitation is issued after the date of this Act are awarded in accordance with title IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities or other facilities or equipment damaged, rendered inoperable, or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, drought, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency, or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials, equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 204. Appropriations in this title shall be available for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchases of reprints; payment for telephone services in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

Mr. BEVILL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order against the title?

If not, are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for energy supply, research and development activities, and other activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 35, of which 23 are for replacement only), \$2,854,053,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the \$7,500,000 provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 1991, (Public Law 101-514) available only for the modification and operation of the Power Burst Facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, shall be available for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy Research Program.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses; the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of electricity to provide enrichment services; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 28, of which 25 are for replacement only), \$1,337,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That revenues received by the Department for the enrichment of uranium and estimated to total \$1,547,000,000, in fiscal year 1992 shall be retained and used for the specific purpose of offsetting costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment service activities as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as uranium enrichment revenues are received during fiscal year 1992 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1992 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for general science and research activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 7 for replacement only) \$1,405,489,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 35, line 12, after "expended," insert ", of

which \$10,000,000 is for the design of project 92-G-302, Fermi Lab main injector"

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an important one for Fermi Laboratory. It will keep the Fermi Laboratory injector on schedule. It provides \$10 million for design for that injector. It is not a new start.

This amendment differs from the one I offered in committee. In the committee I offered an amendment in the amount of \$43,500,000 which was to be taken from the SSC funding. The committee did not agree with my amendment because it was described as a new start. This amendment does not do that.

I have since talked to the chairman of this subcommittee, and to the Republican member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. This amendment, I understand, has their approval.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment and we agree with the gentleman, who is our friend and colleague, that the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], from Chicago, for yielding.

The subcommittee has always supported the efforts and the fine work done at Fermi lab.

As has been previously stated here, we just simply ran out of money this year. Without prejudice, we still continue to support it.

We appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and what he has done to bring this compromise. I thank the gentleman for being willing to compromise.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, do support the amendment that the gentleman from Illinois is offering at this point.

I rise really to, however, in hopes that what the gentleman is doing will be noted by the delegations from Illinois, New York, and California, because what the gentleman is facing right now with respect to the effort at protecting funds for Fermi will be just the beginning of an ongoing struggle.

The operating costs of the superconducting super collider will represent some 74 percent of the operating costs of all the other accelerators

combined within the high-energy-physics budget.

It is simple arithmetic that something is going to have to give. So the effort that the gentleman from Illinois is being forced to make this year he will have to, I submit, be having to make year in and year out if we are going to be protecting Fermi, Brookhaven, and Stanford linear accelerator in California, New York, and Illinois, and I would submit that the time is now to kill the superconducting super collider.

This is not just an issue of what States are going to be benefited or which will lose. The real issue is the conflict between big science and small science.

□ 1430

An awful lot of members of the scientific community have serious reservations about the investment we are about to make in the super collider. This is one dimension of the concern.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman raises a very good point. Certainly the future of our country depends on the continued advances of science. Unfortunately, we were not able to get the money that I think was necessary to advance the Fermi injector as quickly as the schedule calls for it to move ahead.

Nevertheless, this amendment will permit that work to continue to go forward. I am grateful to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and I am grateful to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for their cooperation.

Mr. WOLPE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying.

The point I am trying to make here is that it is the crowding out of funding for Fermi and many other projects that will be the direct consequence of the decision to go ahead.

Mr. YATES. I would hope that the present scale-up of costs of the SSC does not continue at the same rate that it has shown in the past. We supported the SSC when it was presented. It is a long-needed advance for high energy physics.

There is just no money in the budget this year for all the things that we should be doing. This is one of them that ought to be capped.

This amendment reduces my original amendment from \$43 million to \$10 million. It does not transfer funds from the SSC as my original amendment does. It takes funds from the entire appropriation for energy programs in the Department of Energy.

The funds will be used for completing the design of the new Fermi injector, a high energy physics research program, second only to the SSC in its importance for basic research. It is only one-fourth of the amount approved in the President's budget. The full \$43 million has been approved by OMB. But I know how tight this budget is and that the

full \$43 million is not available even if budgeted.

It is most important that progress be made in the Fermi injector, progress this year. That is why I offer this change from my original amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. The gentleman makes a good point about the future of Fermi Lab, one of our premier scientific facilities in the country.

I am deeply disturbed when I read the testimony of the former director of the Fermi Lab, Leon Letterman, who testified before the Senate in April of this year that it is likely that two facilities would have to be closed to make room for the SSC budget.

Now, this is a serious problem we are facing, and I know the gentleman who is so familiar with the outstanding facility in Illinois at Fermi Lab shares that concern. Those Members from New York, who are concerned about a future facility like Brookhaven also have a concern, as do the people from Colorado who are so concerned about the Stanford linear accelerator. The way things are going I am concerned that we will eat up all the funding for all the other vital projects.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for their willingness to go along with the \$10 million to get the Fermi Lab project under way.

Obviously, we would have preferred the full \$43 million as we were arguing for earlier in the year. However, I recognize the constraints under which the committee is operating. I do hope that our action today indicates an acceptance of the scientific needs for the new Fermi Lab injector ring and a commitment to move ahead with that project.

The tevatron accelerator at Fermi Lab was always intended as a complement to the SSC project because it would be quite a number of years until that would really come on line with the SSC. Its purpose is, in part, as I indicated, to bridge the gap between now and the time when SSC is up and running. I do not think we can, as a nation, afford to sit still for the next 10 years until SSC is ready. That may be a long time out.

There has been a concern expressed here about the ever-increasing cost, and that may very well tend to delay it all the more, which justifies, in my judgment, all the more, the Fermi Lab bridging that gap. We need to continue our study of advances, and that is what the upgrade of Fermi Lab accelerator will enable us to do.

Initially when the SSC project was awarded, commitments were made that support for Fermi Lab would continue.

I was and continue to be a supporter of SSC. We would like to have had it in Illinois. We lost it. However, we still, as a matter of scientific advancement, support the effort. Of course, in part, the expectation that Fermi Lab then would continue to play an integral role with the SSC to advance our high physics scientific knowledge.

I just want to make it clear that in appreciation for the fact that we do have an accommodation here, and an agreement, that I would oppose all amendments today that would cut the funding for SSC as an expression of our good faith that we will concurrently move ahead with both the SSC and Fermi Lab.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] on his leadership in this effort.

I, too, would like to rise in support of the Yates amendment. I think it is a very straightforward amendment. I think there is no question that the success of the super collider project depends to a large degree on the success of the Fermi Lab project in Illinois.

I would like to point out that we are spending \$30 million of SSC funds at the Fermi Lab this year, but also I would like to point out that in this budget that is before Members, the Fermi Lab will receive \$240 million in operating funds and \$17 million in construction funds, plus the \$10 million.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and emphasize the importance of the position that the Fermi Lab does occupy in the scientific advances of our country.

I think that much more money will be required for the Fermi Lab injector. The money that the Yates amendment makes available will go to complete the design. After that, we have to look to construction of the ring itself.

Mr. MICHEL. The comments of the gentleman are very well taken.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the leader for yielding.

As so often is the case I agree with most of what the gentleman says. Fermi Lab is a premier research facility in America. I am most anxious, as I know the gentleman in the well, to see Fermi Lab continue to do its outstanding work.

The problem is that the SSC is going to eat up all the money available, not only for Fermi Lab, but for Stanford

and Brookhaven in the future in this year's budget. DOE requested a total of \$516 million for Fermi Lab, Brookhaven, and Stanford, and yet we are told that the SSC's annual operating cost at today's dollars will be \$380 million. Of course, the SSC is not up and operating yet, and it is unlikely that it will be for many years to come. But the fact of the matter is I want the gentleman to understand fully the implications for the future of Fermi Lab, for Brookhaven, for Stanford, for all the other facilities, the implications of funding this one single project of questionable value.

I thank my leader for the leadership he has shown.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman makes a valuable contribution in the whole scientific field in the committee on which he serves. I am mindful of the problem that he has outlined for Members.

I guess it comes down to the bottom line: we just have to move ahead. Obviously, some of these projects are going to be extended because of our incapacity, frankly, to ante up all the kinds of money that they are requiring.

I thank my distinguished chairman and the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee for their excellent leadership in putting this bill together.

Given the tight limits set by last year's budget agreement, this was no easy feat, and it was accomplished only by proscribing any new construction starts, new buildings or new facilities. While we may "blame" the limits imposed by the 1990 budget agreement, we should also credit our committee's discipline. By going this route, however, the subcommittee was able to fund important science, defense, and water projects, while appropriating \$115 million less than the amount requested by the President.

So, I would advise my colleagues that this is a well-crafted bill, a tightly budgeted bill, and one that is worthy of support.

I'd like to point out several items of particular merit.

First, the subcommittee did an excellent job in funding energy research, particularly in the area of solar and renewable energy. The bill provides \$236 million for solar and renewables, a \$39 million increase over this year's funding, and \$35 million more than the President requested.

That's all the more remarkable because, due to budget constraints, this was the only energy research area

funded above the President's request. The reason solar and renewables received this increase was that the chairman and the subcommittee recognized that it deserved an especially high priority. I want to thank and congratulate the chairman for his leadership in proposing this wise funding decision.

After all, solar and other renewable energy sources and energy conservation offer the best opportunities to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. The President's national energy strategy largely ignores solar and conservation, and would leave us even more dependent on foreign oil in the year 2000 than we are today.

Solar and renewable energy resources, on the other hand, are providing the country with clean energy today, at increasingly competitive costs. These energy sources hold the greatest potential on the "supply side" for reducing our foreign-oil dependence and doing it in the most environmentally sound manner.

The bill also does an excellent job in funding environmental, biological, and general science and research conducted by the Department of Energy. Some of the work DOE is funding includes a fundamental study of the human genetic structure, research into global climate change, research support for the further development of advanced supercomputers, and fusion research. The bill also funds the Department's educational efforts aimed at drawing more of our best young minds into scientific studies and careers.

On the defense side, the bill provides \$4.4 billion for environmental cleanup and waste management at DOE sites across the Nation, \$44 million more than the President requested and \$867 million higher than 1991 funding; \$157 million of this amount is targeted for cleanup and waste work at Rocky Flats next year. While these increases are needed and important, this program has been growing at an extraordinary rate, and it warrants particularly careful oversight by the Department and Congress to assure the efficient and effective use of the moneys appropriated.

In addition, the bill funds \$10 million to carry out the second year of projects by the cities of Broomfield, Thornton, Westminster, Northglenn, and Federal Heights to protect the water quality in Great Western Reservoir and Standley Lake, water sources for nearly a quarter of a million people near Rocky Flats.

Finally, the committee report contains language directing the Secretary of Energy to establish an expert panel to evaluate the need to resume plutonium recovery and reprocessing operations at the Rocky Flats plant. Funds for resuming those operations could not be spent until the evaluation is completed and the Secretary determines that there is no practical alter-

native to resuming those operations at Rocky Flats.

The subcommittee included this language at my request because of reports and studies conducted by the Energy Department, the National Academy of Sciences, the Congressional Research Service, and others indicating that there may be sufficient plutonium recovery and reprocessing capacity at sites other than Rocky Flats to meet national security needs. If this is so, or to the extent that it is so, the subcommittee agreed that it might be less expensive and more efficient to perform those operations at these other, newer departmental facilities, rather than to spend tens of millions of dollars to upgrade the older facilities at Rocky Flats. This is all the more sensible given that DOE plans to relocate these operations away from Rocky Flats in the not-distant future.

Again, I thank the chairman for his leadership in drawing this bill together, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1440

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I rise to commend the committee for the work they have done on this legislation and the bill they have put together, given the competing requests that they must contend with for the financial resources to fund all the programs within their jurisdiction, and I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for the leadership they have shown on these issues, and especially with respect to those issues for the funding of the Bureau of Reclamation and the projects for the 17 Western States that are so important to our economy and to much of the environmental improvement that we are trying to get the Bureau to do that this committee have been so helpful for.

I would also like to comment on the language found on page 39 of the bill dealing with the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. This section of the bill earmarks \$20 million to the local communities in the plant area as economic compensation.

As some Members may know, the Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and Interior Committees are currently in the midst of negotiations on legislation to authorize the use of the WIPP facility.

In the midst of these negotiations, we learned that this bill provided \$20 million in economic compensation to the State of New Mexico and local counties.

I would point out that this Member, and others involved in the negotiations, were not consulted on this mat-

ter. In my view, this \$20 million seriously prejudices these negotiations.

As a result, I have concluded that this \$20 million plus \$40 million previously made available, more than adequately compensates New Mexico for any impacts from the WIPP test phase. Any further compensation to the State of New Mexico, or the counties involved, is unwarranted and unjustified.

Sixty million dollars is more than adequate compensation by the taxpayers. Let me point out to my colleagues that this is a considerable amount of money in light of the amount of waste that will go into WIPP during the test phase. Less than one-half of 1 percent of the repository will be used during the test phase. A total of \$60 million in economic compensation funds from the Federal Treasury certainly seems adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer a motion to strike the language in this bill at this time. However, it is my current intent to oppose any further economic compensation for the test phase as we consider the negotiations on the authorizing bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water, Power and Offshore Energy Resources of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and join in congratulating the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] on the enormously difficult task of putting this together.

I rise also in concern for this WIPP issue.

Mr. Chairman, my subcommittee visited the WIPP site on March 25. We held a hearing on April 16 and we are going to mark up the bill on June 11; but there is 20 million bucks in this for WIPP, even though they have not started operations. They have already gotten \$40 million. That is a total of \$60 million and this facility has not yet begun to operate.

Now, it may be that they deserve the \$60 million down the road. It seems to me there ought to be some coordination during the authorizing process and the appropriating process. I would hope that either the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], or the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], or the appropriate subcommittee, in this case the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP], and myself might have been consulted.

Nevertheless, I will not object, but I want to strongly associate myself with the remarks of my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and say that this is it. Sixty million

bucks is enough. We are going to pay the people of Nevada for Yucca Mountain. There has to be a limit as to what the Congress is willing to spend in this form.

This is not good public policy. It is good politics; but it is not good public policy and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] in his strong objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if I can just reclaim my time, I would just say that the taxpayers have spent close to a billion dollars on this facility. We think it is important that we make every effort to get this facility open, to get the test phase underway. The Appropriations Committee has struggled with this for over a decade, but we also want to make sure that we do not set up the same dynamics that we just witnessed with the super collider where the testing of the waste facility starts to draw away from the interest of every other Member of the Congress.

It is in the national interest, I believe, to find out whether or not we can safely store this level of radioactive waste and whether we can do it in a competent fashion; but if we set up the dynamics for that test and it in and of itself starts to drain resources away from the other concerns of Members of Congress, then I do not think that test will necessarily be able to go forward.

Clearly, the State of New Mexico must be compensated. They have been saddled with the disposal of this waste and the impact, but we have got to make sure there are some equities in this process and that the Appropriations Committee does not get caught in the same jam as we just witnessed previously with the super collider.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to simply say that I agree with the gentleman completely on this issue. It comes as somewhat of a surprise to find this \$20 million in additional compensation to New Mexico when we have not even been able to open the facility for the very limited purpose of testing it.

As the gentleman has pointed out, there is going to be a flurry of activity there for 2 or 3 months, 5 or 6 or something, and then it is going to sit idle fundamentally for 5 years while we wait to see if it works.

The money has been appropriated to compensate New Mexico for the infrastructure that they have had to con-

struct. That is appropriate. We should have done that. We have done it, but I agree with the gentleman that this is sufficient compensation for the 5-year test period. What we do in compensation after we actually get it open we will deal with at another time.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and again thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Hopefully, this money will provide a little incentive to get on with the process of getting the test under way.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY: Page 35, line 11, strike \$1,405,489,000 and insert \$1,015,239,000.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is cosponsored by my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] would reduce the amount of funding in title III \$390,250,000.

This is intended to cut all funding for the superconducting super collider and leave enough money for an orderly shutdown of the project.

Mr. Chairman, "Man does not serve science. Science must serve man." These are the words of a physics professor who wrote me opposing funding for the superconducting super collider.

Science has served our Nation well. It has helped make us the economic leader we are today. As we continue to support scientific inquiry, it is crucial that we carefully plan how we will spend our limited resources. It is for this reason that I strongly support increased funding for this Nation's broadly based scientific research programs.

I oppose the SSC funding for the same reason. Put simply, the costs of the SSC are too high and the benefits are too uncertain for the SSC to be a responsible recipient of America's limited research dollars at a time when our Nation is facing \$350 billion deficits.

The American Physical Society, which represents more than 41,000 scientists nationwide, officially gives limited support for the SSC, provided that the funding required, and I quote, "Not be at the expense of the broadly based scientific research program of the United States."

Unfortunately, this is exactly what continued funding of the SSC will do, take funds from other important research projects for the super collider.

For proof, we need to look no further than this bill, that contains cuts in the Fermi lab and we have already heard that the Appropriations Committee plans to terminate funding for the space station.

The SSC will concentrate research dollars in an area that accounts for less than 1 percent of all science education.

Furthermore, the SSC proponents exaggerate the potential for technical spinoffs from this project. According to the Congressional Budget Office, technological spinoffs are more likely if we fund a broad base of research programs, rather than a few large projects.

Questions about the potential uses and inevitable obsolescence of the SSC become more important when we consider how much this program costs.

□ 1450

Earlier this year DOE officially estimated that this project would cost \$8.25 billion. This estimate fails to include, the cost of detectors, spare magnets, operating costs during construction or adequate funding for contingencies like site geology problems.

On May 10 of this year DOE admitted that the SSC cost would be \$9.1 billion if the magnet and operating costs were included.

With all of these costs included, DOE's own independent cost estimators put the tab at \$11.8 billion.

Keep in mind that this cost was estimated in 1987 to be \$5.6 billion. So far, DOE has a firm commitment for \$1 billion from Texas and India. That means the U.S. taxpayers could be forced to pick up the tab for the remaining \$10.8 billion.

GAO has already concluded that the SSC's magnet testing and construction schedule is too tight and this will result in delays and increased costs. Its magnets have not yet been built or tested. Preliminary testing of prototype magnets is not even scheduled until October 1992.

We will not know whether the actual magnets will work until 1994. As happened with the Isabelle accelerator, the magnets might not work, and we will have to abandon the SSC after wasting billions of dollars.

Finally, we need to examine the impact the SSC program will have on already underfunded basic research programs across the country. Please consider the basic fact: \$434 million this year for the SSC is enough money to give two research universities in each State \$4.34 million for basic research. Think about it.

In future years we will need to spend about \$1 billion a year to construct and operate the SSC by 1999. That is enough money to give two research universities in each State \$10 million a year.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WOLPE and by unanimous consent, Mr. SLATTERY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SLATTERY. As I said, Mr. Chairman, that is enough money to give two research universities in each State \$10 million a year for graduate fellowships and basic research.

Some might say, "Well, are we going to get anything out of the SSC?" The answer to that is, "Yes, we are going to get something out of the SSC." I hope we do, if we spend \$11 billion or \$10 billion or even \$5 billion. We need to get something out of the SSC.

But in the final analysis, my friends, we must ask a basic question: Will our country be better off 10 years, 20 years from now if we pour all of this money into the SSC? Or will we be better off if we take part of this money and put it into the desperately needed basic research in our universities all across this country? I have concluded, Mr. Chairman, that we will be much better off by supporting small science and not this big project that is certain to drain enormous sums of money from desperately underfunded basic research. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we are really truly interested in the scientific future of this country and our economic competitiveness, we cannot continue to ignore basic research.

With the adoption and with the support of the super collider, we are going to choke off basic research in this country. There is no other way to look at it. We have already seen evidence of it here today, Mr. Chairman.

Without any further ado, I would urge my colleagues to carefully listen to the debate here today and support terminating further funding of the super collider.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I followed the superconducting super collider for a long time, and until today I have always voted for it with strings attached. But I voted for it. But my patience has been tested to the limit.

I have become convinced that this body has repeatedly been misled by the Department of Energy and it has been misled for a very simple reason, the usual reason: The truth would never be enough to get this body or the American taxpayers to shell out the money for this project.

The way developments are occurring, the SSC will make the infamous \$600 toilet seat look like a bargain.

Let us look at just a few of the ways we have been sold a bill of goods. First, price, not an insignificant concern in these deficit-ridden days. The SSC was first presented to cost \$5 billion. Then it was submitted to Congress at \$5.3 billion, then \$5.9 billion, then \$8.2 billion. Where is the end?

After each escalation, we were told the cost was set. But there is, frankly, reason to adjust the current cost esti-

mate. The department admitted in congressional testimony that to make the SSC ready to use as opposed, I guess, to just pretty to look at, the real current cost estimate is \$9.1 billion. But many experts question even that enormous sum. DOE's own independent cost-estimating panel thinks the cost will turn out to be \$12 billion, approximately.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a high-stakes poker game, make no mistake about it. Today we have just put in the ante money. Our hand will be called many, many times, and in each instance we are going to have to put a lot more of our precious dollars into the pot.

We have also been misled about the Federal share of that cost. Last year, DOE told us that the project would not cost the taxpayers more than \$5 billion. Indeed, as I have mentioned already today, the House passed such a spending cap by a substantial margin. Now the department's Federal cost estimate is up another \$600 million. That is assuming the \$8.2 billion total is correct. The \$5.6 billion figure also assumes that foreign contributions will cover a portion of the project's cost. The total received from foreign governments to date: zip, nothing, zilch. In fact, so far the foreign investment has consisted of us, the United States, paying for a team of Indian scientists to spend time in Texas. DOE must be confusing foreign contributions with foreign aid.

Science funding as a whole is not exactly in a flush period, despite recent increases. Take a look at grant figures for the National Institutes of Health, for example. In 1975, NIH was able to award funds to 60 percent of the proposals it found worthy of funding. Today, that rate is down to 25 percent. And remember, that is 25 percent of only those proposals that have been found to merit funding.

Figures for the National Science Foundation tell a similar story.

SSC supporters are always telling us that their project must go forward to attract young people to science. What a noble objective. But their project is going to freeze young people out of science. Young scientists all recite approval rates at NSF and NIH as leading factors in determining whether they will stay in the research arena. Just think how many grants to young researchers could be funded with \$8.2 billion, and the staggering array of projects that would be conducted.

The relative handful of researchers working at the SSC in the narrow area of high-energy physics can hardly compare to that.

What about industry? A survey of the top corporate researchers—these are people from the private sector, at leading American firms—found that they rank the SSC as the least viable, get that, the least viable of five big science projects; lower than the human genome

project, the national aerospace plane, the space station, more even than star wars.

So whose priority is the SSC anyway? Not the Nation's struggling young scientists who are starving for individual investigative grants across a wide variety of fields; not the Nation's scientific societies who support the SSC only to the extent other needs are met first; not the Nation's leading corporations, who see the SSC as having fewer industrial spinoffs than any other big science project; not the House of Representatives, which voted last year to discontinue the project if it was going to cost the Federal Government more than \$5 billion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. The SSC is a priority for only three groups; for Texas officials, and we can all understand that, who obtained a giant public works project for their State; for DOE officials who would rather continually break promises made to Congress than cancel the project; and for a relatively small group of researchers in an esoteric field who, understandably, think their research is more important than anyone else's.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, are these the groups that should be setting the priorities of the U.S. Congress?

Vote for this amendment so that next year we can set the priorities for science spending in this country. Vote against the SSC now, or pay more later.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, let me close by reminding my colleagues that I am on the committee of jurisdiction for a project, which incidentally has never been authorized by the Congress. I have previously supported the SSC as good science. But, measured against all the other good science out there, I do not give it the priority that my colleagues from Texas understandably do.

This project should not go forward for all the right reasons. We have to be concerned with establishing priorities in this Congress. We have limited resources. Let us use them wisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SLATTERY and by unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, let me further point out that this is a bipartisan effort on both sides of the aisle. It is an effort that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], my chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, and I launched

earlier in the year with extensive hearings. We talked to everybody. It looked like a Texas reunion in our subcommittee when we had our meetings because all the Texas delegation showed up. So would every one of my colleagues show up to protect this multimillion dollar project with a job potential if it was in their district.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that, but we have to be concerned with America.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the ranking minority member of the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. He has worked tirelessly on this project. I deeply appreciate the effort he has made. His knowledge is very apparent here today, and I hope that our colleagues will listen.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "I really appreciate your effort and thank you very much."

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for this amendment that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART], and I, along with my Committee on Science, Space, and Technology colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will offer to eliminate the funding for the SSC.

Mr. Chairman, since the inception of this project in 1983, we have seen DOE's own cost estimates rise from \$5 billion to \$5.3 billion to \$5.9 billion to \$7.8 billion to a figure of \$8.2 billion. Yet, today the Department of Energy comes before Congress and says "Forget everything we have told you in the past. Judge us by our new cost and schedule baseline. We are adhering to that." Well, there are two major flaws in that approach. First, the Department's new baseline was issued in January 1991—after more than \$500 million had been appropriated by Congress on the basis of cost estimates and timeframes that the Department now so cavalierly asks us to forget. DOE can't adopt a clean slate approach to the cost and baseline of this project every time something goes astray. It is a disingenuous, irresponsible approach to the expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

Second, the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, which I chair, recently held a hearing to review the status of the SSC. At that hearing, we saw many ominous signs that the Department will not be

able to build the project according to the new cost and schedule baseline that has been established, and may not be able to deliver all of the science that is promised.

First, the Department has not laid out the full costs of this project. It is already very clear—using DOE's own numbers—that the total cost will be higher than the \$8.249 billion projected by the Department.

The Department admits there are associated costs not included in its \$8.2 billion estimate—\$507 million is scheduled to be spent between fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1999, during the construction phase of the project, in establishing the SSC lab. DOE did not include these funds in its project cost estimate. Yet, in fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991, the Department actually drained funds from activities that were included in the project cost estimate to support these operations.

Another estimated \$110 million will be spent on post-commissioning operational spare parts for the SSC. Contrary to normal Departmental policy, these costs are not included in the project cost estimate.

Yet, DOE concedes that both of these additional cost items are essential to the completion of the project. In a February 1991 letter the SSC lab's general manager wrote, "The associated laboratory costs * * * and costs for operational spares are required to accomplish this project."

In summary, there are \$600 million in costs that never seem to get reported when talking about the cost of the project. But regardless of how DOE defines them, they are being expended, the project cannot be completed without them, and they are costs associated with the project that the taxpayer must bear.

In addition, the Department's estimate lacks \$219 million in foreign contingency moneys. In calculating the amount of contingency funds that should be included in the cost estimate, DOE subtracted \$219 million from the contingency total to reflect the amount of contingency associated with an expected \$1.7 billion in foreign in-kind contributions. However, this sum should not have been excluded from the cost estimate. First, no prior cost estimate has ever been adjusted in this way. Second, the Department's own position now seems to be that foreign contributions will largely come in the form of cash near the end of the project rather than in-kind. This means that contingency costs that are usually absorbed when contributions are in-kind will not automatically be covered by foreign contributions. Finally, foreign contributions to date are so small that it is unlikely that cash contributions will even cover the expected \$1.7 billion allotment, much less another \$219 million in contingency costs.

These three items alone—lab operations, spares, and foreign contingency—in combination with the Department's cost estimate, push the program costs over \$9 billion.

Second, DOE's own internal analysis casts doubt on the likelihood that the project will attract \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. Throughout the project, the administration has assured the public that one-third of the project's cost will be paid through non-Federal contributions. One-third of DOE's project cost estimate currently amounts to \$2.6 billion. Since Texas has pledged \$875 million to offset project costs, DOE must attract \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions to fulfill the one-third pledge. To be blunt, that will never happen again. DOE's own project milestones call for foreign cost sharing agreements to be presented to Congress for approval in June of this year. Not one such agreement has been or will be delivered by that milestone. In fact, DOE has only been able to secure one pledge of \$50 million. If we need further proof that the \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions is an unrealistic figure, we need only refer to the assessment contained in an October 1990 DOE status report prepared for the White House. It stated the following:

* * * We believe that we are unlikely to meet the administration's goal for non-Federal participation (one-third of the total project cost) in the foreseeable future.

DOE's analysis of the foreign contribution situation suggests that much of the anticipated foreign support will come late in the project, if at all. However, DOE's funding schedule for the SSC calls for receiving a total of \$660 million in foreign contributions between fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1995. If DOE's analysis of the foreign situation is accurate and these scheduled contributions do not come in on time, the Department will either have to ask Congress for additional appropriations to make up the difference or accept schedule slippages that add more than \$1 million a day to the project.

This bleak outlook has become even bleaker. An article in yesterday's New York Times reported that Japan has told the United States it will be very reluctant to contribute to future United States science projects because of funding uncertainties surrounding the space station. DOE has been counting on Japan to provide \$1 billion to the SSC.

In the face of these problems, the Department has been backing away from the one-third pledge. In testimony and in written communications to my subcommittee, it is now referring to the one-third non-Federal contribution as a goal. It is very clear DOE will not recommend that Congress abandon the project if the foreign contributions do not materialize. Thus, it is very clear that the taxpayers will likely be called

upon to fund another \$1.6 billion in costs associated with this project. Unfortunately, it will only be after billions have been sunk into the project that the Department will admit that these additional costs will have to be borne by the taxpayer.

As a result of these factors, the current taxpayer exposure is much higher than the \$5.649 billion that DOE claims. I have prepared a chart which provides a more realistic assessment of what Congress can expect to be the bill to the taxpayers. To summarize, DOE's cost estimate leaves out significant associated costs and is overly optimistic about the true prospects of receiving \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. Taking the associated project costs of \$816 million that I outlined earlier, and adding that to DOE's estimate of \$8.249 billion, and adjusting this total for the \$50 million pledged by India and the \$875 pledged by Texas, we see that the true current project cost is \$9.1 billion and the current liability faced by the taxpayers is \$8.15 billion. This is \$2.5 billion higher than the Department's reported Federal share of the project cost estimate.

In light of this, it is ironic that just last year the Department supported the authorizing legislation approved overwhelmingly by 309 Members of this body that set a \$5 billion cap on Federal expenditures for this project. Even the Department's own numbers no longer comply with that cap. The true numbers certainly don't. Not surprisingly, DOE's representatives now tell us that the Department no longer supports such a cap. Will this House stand by the cap it voted overwhelmingly to establish only last year? That is what this amendment is all about.

Doubts about the project go beyond cost and contribution projections. DOE has established what it terms a success oriented approach and schedule for this project. This means that it has set a very short timeframe for the accomplishment of some very complicated tasks and the resolution of highly complex technical questions. The problem with such an approach is that everything is so tightly wound together that a failure in any one area will lead to delays and increased costs in other areas. One dangerous result of this nose-to-tail scheduling is the constant temptation to cut corners or ignore technical problems in an effort to stay on schedule.

Congress must insist on knowing the full, true cost of a project, and that means the cost of doing it right and building it to perform up to expectations. If a schedule is designed in a way that threatens those goals, then Congress has not received an accurate cost estimate, and the cost will either rise to reflect unavoidable schedule delays or else the country may end up with a multibillion-dollar project built to cost but unable to work as intended. There

are already some troubling signs about the DOE's approach.

The project has already missed important milestones, including development of the project management plan, the request for proposals for main ring dipole magnets, the request for proposals for main ring quadrupole magnets, agreements on foreign participation, and the record of decision on the supplemental environmental impact statement. While no great problems have emerged as a result, the fact that even these relatively easy, but important, milestones have already slipped raises questions about what will happen to the milestones for the more difficult, technically complicated tasks.

In fact, there have already been unanticipated problems in the magnet development program. Quality control problems at Fermi Lab were serious enough to compel the SSC lab management to establish a second line of industrial fabrication of SSC dipole magnets at Brookhaven. This second track, which will have Westinghouse working with one design at Brookhaven National Lab while General Dynamics works with a different design at Fermi Lab, is costing an additional \$6.5 million in fiscal year 1991 that was not in the budget. The money is being drawn from management reserves and DOE contingency funds.

There has also been a significant setback in the detector program, just recently one of the two detector collaborations, that associated with the L* detector group, has fallen apart. As a consequence former L* participants are reluctant to engage in further cooperation with the SSC lab or DOE, and because of the length of time it takes to establish a consortia and settle on a detector design, it seems likely that there will be only one large detector on line when the SSC accelerator is commissioned in 1999. This raises serious questions about whether the SSC will be able to deliver the full range of science that has been promised to Congress and American taxpayers.

Finally, after the SSC is commissioned, its operating costs will swamp the high energy physics budget. The entire budget request for all other high energy physics accelerator facilities is approximately \$516 million in fiscal year 1992. The projected annual cost of operating the SSC after it is commissioned is \$380 million in fiscal year 1992 dollars. That is 74 percent of the entire budget for all of the accelerator labs. DOE concedes that some existing facilities will have to be closed in order to manage this budget drain. If the costs of a second large detector, which could cost up to a billion dollars, roll over into the operating years, the annual operating cost will increase even more.

In conclusion, this project is already showing traits similar to those of many white elephants of the past.

Costs grow. Timeframes stretch out. Every baseline estimate that goes awry is replaced by a new and improved version, which we are assured is the final and correct one. Until, that is, it too goes awry and is replaced by another new and improved estimate. The project is designed so that there are only two stages: Too soon to tell and too late to stop. The objective of DOE is to get Congress to sink so much money into the project that it is compelled to continue funding even when it is clear the costs will be much higher than originally projected, and the project may not deliver what was originally promised. The Department's theme seems to be: "Promise them anything, just don't let them find out the true cost."

History is full of failed projects and boondoggles that have moved through this body with the same game plan. The Synthetic Fuels Corporation, the Clinch River Breeder Reactor, the Isabelle Particle Accelerator, and Westway just to name a few. Eventually, they were killed but generally only after hundreds of millions of dollars were wasted, and deserving programs were left to die on the vine due to lack of available resources.

How many more times must we fall for the same kind of wallet-on-a-string-trick? Must this body always allow billions of dollars to be squandered on a project before we can stand up and say "No more"? This amendment affords us an opportunity to be honest with the taxpayers and honest with ourselves before billions of dollars are wasted.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment to terminate the SSC.

□ 1510

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GLICKMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment primarily because the House went on record last year as supporting a cap for this project. I see that cap slipping away from us. The \$5 billion Federal commitment seems to be going down the drain, and in this era of very limited Federal dollars, science, and otherwise, I think that this amendment offers us an opportunity to say that the super collider will only have a certain amount of Federal commitment and no more, and that the rest of the moneys have to be obtained from other sources. I think that this is a fiscally responsible amendment.

I applaud the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] as well as the authors of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of efforts to withhold funding of the superconducting super collider given the uncertainties of this project balanced with our current Federal deficit.

Like a little boy in a candystore, there are many things we would like to buy with our Federal dollars. But while so much looks appealing to the child, he realizes he has limited pennies in his pocket to spend on all the candy he wants. He learns a lesson that will serve him well in his life. He must make choices based on the limits on his resources.

Like the little boy, this Congress must make a spending priority choice based on our limited available Federal funds. The SSC is simply a very expensive treat in the candystore of Federal projects that need funding.

The little boy may choose not to buy the one big expensive candy bar if it means he can, instead, purchase dozens of little penny candies. Funding the SSC will drain Federal financial support from thousands of smaller, but equally important, scientific efforts.

Perhaps the boy may decide not to purchase certain candies that he would like to have because they are not worth the price he must pay. Because of the continued escalating cost of this project and questions about whether the technology can even work, this Congress must realize that even if the SSC has some merit it is not worth the \$9 billion, and rising, pricetag. We must stop pouring money into the big black hole that has become the SSC.

Last Congress, during consideration of the superconducting super collider project authorization over 300 Members of this House supported language that capped the Federal contribution to the SSC at \$5 billion. Unfortunately, the Senate never considered the SSC authorization and the will of the House was ignored.

It's time to reexpress our will and our resolve to hold down wasteful spending. Just 3 weeks ago, the Department of Energy conceded that, once again, the total cost of this project was higher than previously acknowledged, now costing at a minimum \$9.1 billion. This is almost a \$1 billion more than the estimate DOE provided in January of this year and almost \$4 billion above the original price tag for this program.

We should be skeptical when the cost increases \$1 billion in 6 months and \$4 billion since the first authorization just 4 years ago, and not one shovel of dirt has been turned. Further, DOE's own Independent Cost Estimating staff has determined the price may actually cost at least \$11.8 billion and GAO believes future costs may continue to increase.

Will the cost ever stop skyrocketing in time for Congress to make a decision on whether to continue funding this? Apparently not, and given the unproven and questionable technology that many scientists say may not even work I think the time has come to stop funding altogether this project.

Imagine buying a house and agreeing on a price. Then each year the cost rises and you are required to pay the new price, rather than the original price, if you eventually want to own the house. You cannot stop making pay-

ments because you will forfeit your entire investment and lose the house. So you must continue to make payments on the property. This is what may happen if we don't stop funding the SSC project before construction starts.

As we sink billions of dollars into building the super collider, the cost is certain to continue to rise. Then what do we do? Stop funding it and lose the investment we have already committed or do we allow the taxpayers to be held hostage to a game of blackmail in which we must pay whatever cost is needed to finish the project.

Virtually every year I have sat in Science Committee hearings and listened to DOE officials cite increased cost figures above the previous year's estimate. Each year they claim the new numbers are more realistic than in the previous year and are unlikely to increase. Yet every year the price tag does increase. Dare we start this project only to find out halfway through that the costs have continued to escalate and we cannot finish the project unless Congress kicks in more money?

In this era of budget constraints, such a choice is no choice at all. Let's learn a lesson from the little boy buying the candy. Let's choose not to buy the superconducting super collider.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], brought out that basic fact. Many people are saying, "Why should I vote against it this year when last year I voted for it?" The answer is very basic.

There is a big difference between what happened last year when we imposed a \$5 billion cap and this year when the DOE's own cost estimates indicate it is going to cost \$5.7 billion just for the Federal share.

Last year we talked about a 20-percent floor for foreign participation. This year we find ourselves, 12 months after the vote of last May 2, with zero foreign participation, zilch, not a penny.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, there is another very important reason why Members are justified in changing their position on this issue at this time. In 1987, when this issue was first brought before the body, the federal budget deficit was projected by the administration at that time to be nearly zero for fiscal year 1992-93.

Right now, as we all know, the deficit, if we are honest, is going to be somewhere between \$300 billion and

\$400 billion. And when the economic conditions and the fiscal conditions of the country change as dramatically as they have changed, then we are required, my colleagues, to make different decisions about spending priorities.

That, Mr. Chairman, is in and of itself sufficient reason for us to revisit this question and make a decision to not spend this money that we do not have.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] for his observation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all, before I comment specifically on the amendment, I want to apologize to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], chairman of the subcommittee, because he is an excellent chairman. His committee does a superb job meeting the needs of the country. I know how difficult it is being a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations myself. I know how difficult it is to deal with the incredible range of requests that come before one.

Let me simply say that my support for the Slattery amendment does not come because I have any problem at all with the committee. I have a basic problem with the administration because I have concluded that on this subject we simply cannot trust the word and we cannot trust the numbers of this administration.

This project has become an incredible dollar gobble which will squeeze out not only taxpayers' dollars but will squeeze out an awful lot of good science all around the country, unless we make a tough-minded decision to close it down now.

I happen to think that in theory the super collider is a pretty good project. I happen to think that there is considerable information about basic physics that we can gain from it. And I have not really wanted to see this program totally shut down, but I have been forced to reach this conclusion because basically the Department of Energy has not dealt directly or honestly with the Congress since the day this project was first started.

They are playing the traditional game that agencies always play with the Congress. They lowball the program. They get it sneaked under the tent by telling us it is just going to cost a smidgen and then, by golly, like topsy it just grew and it grew and it grew. And then all of a sudden, it is out of control.

That is exactly where we are with this project. We were told originally by the number wizards down at DOE that the cost could be \$5.3 billion. Now we are told, if we believe their estimates, that the cost will be \$8.25 billion. And they reached that conclusion by conveniently setting aside and ignoring in

their calculations a number of other items that total up to well over \$1 billion.

I do not trust the Wolpe numbers that were presented here. I do not trust anybody's numbers any more, because I do not think anybody really knows what they are talking about. I think that is a very good reason to stop, because if we do not know what we are talking about, how can we go to the taxpayers and continue to say, "OK, boys, just a little bit more than last year, just a little bit more than the year before that."

We are making some excruciatingly difficult decisions in this budget. When the HEW appropriations bill comes to the floor, we are going to see that bill is shorted by about \$1,700,000,000. We are going to have to vote for cuts in health care, cuts in worker programs, cuts that we never dreamed we would support, because of the limitations placed on us by the budget.

It seems to me when we are faced with those kinds of choices that we need to exercise the same kind of discipline represented by the elimination of the space station funding in the HUD bill. Unless we are willing to take on these big dollar items and shut them down until the agency has honesty enough and discipline enough to give us honest numbers and tied-together numbers, unless we are willing to do that, we really are not meeting our obligations to the middle class taxpayers of this country who sweat day in and day out to pay the country's bills.

□ 1520

The other point I would like to make is the problem we have with foreign contributions. I swear to God, when I listen to the promises, I think we are watching a movie, waiting for Shoeless Joe Jackson. "Just build the project, and they will come." That is what they are telling us.

Yet the fact is that so far, out of all of those vaunted foreign contributions, we have only \$50 million promised, not delivered, promised, from the Indian Government.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the \$50 million in question allegedly will come from the Indian Government. But they have not sent the first penny yet. What they have sent is a team of Indian scientists to Texas on our tab. So we are not collecting any money from foreign sources. We are actually paying money to foreign sources to look the project over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. SLATTERY and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impose on the time of the House any more. I simply again want to apologize to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for taking the floor on something that is really not any of my business. It is only my business because I represent my taxpayers, just like the gentleman does and every other Member does here. I feel that after years of having been strung along by DOE, I simply do not have any choice. In conscience, I have no choice if I am going to represent what I consider honestly to be the best interests of the country, and that is why I have taken the well for these remarks today.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for a brilliant statement here today. We know the gentleman in the well as being a thoughtful Member of this body, and I just deeply appreciate his remarks and thank him for them.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat befuddled by the debate that has gone on with regard to the Slattery amendment. I have been in Congress since 1985 and have been working on the SSC project since that year. When the decision was made to locate the project in my district in Ellis County, TX, in 1988, the following year we began to have this kind of debate about the project.

The first year we had this debate, quite honestly, I felt some of the cost concerns and technology concerns were valid and needed to be checked out. The second year we had basically the same debate. I thought perhaps some Members had not been listening from the year before.

This year we are having basically the same debate, and I have decided that obviously those of us who support the project have an inability to communicate, because the issues are the same, the arguments that are made against the project are the same, and the facts are the same. Yet we are not able to get the facts through to some of my honorable opponents.

Mr. Chairman, let us go through those facts. First of all, let us take the argument that was raised that the SSC funding is squeezing out other science projects.

I have a sheet from the budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1992, the Office of Management and Budget. In 1991, the budget year we are in right now, we are spending \$11.296 billion on basic civilian research. We are spending \$15.031 billion on applied research.

We are spending \$3.082 billion on research and development facilities. That is a total of \$29.409 billion.

How much are we spending of that on the SSC? \$243 million. Eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Let us go to the proposed budget for 1992. The President proposed \$12.278 billion in basic research, \$16.5 billion in applied research, and \$3.5 billion in research and development facilities, for a total of \$32.375 billion.

How much of that is for the SSC? \$534 million, of which we have already cut \$100 million. That would be 1.6 percent.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about small science, let us talk about the National Science Foundation. Their budget has doubled in the last 3 years, and we are hoping to double it again in the next 3 years. So the squeeze-out argument does not hold up when you look at the facts.

Let us talk about the magnets. There is a lot of concern that the magnets just will not work.

I have in front of me a cross-section of one of the magnets that has actually been tested and proven to work.

Let us look at the magnet test results. I have a copy of those test results in my hand. You cannot see the chart, but it shows six different test magnets. The dotted line is the performance standard, approximately 6.5 million amps. Every one of the test magnets is performing above the standard by an average of 15 percent. The test magnets are working, they are going to continue to work, and there is no question that the production magnets are not going to work.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the cost factor. Opponents have talked about the escalating cost estimates. In point of fact, the SSC is the most audited, reviewed, science project in the history of the Federal Government. In the last year there have been four independent cost estimates of it. The Department of Energy reviewed every one of those estimates. They decided that the \$8.25 billion estimate is the most valid estimate.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I want to return just for a moment to the point about the magnets that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] was making. I think the gentleman was suggesting that the magnets have in fact been fully tested and are performing, exceeding the standards. Is it not the case that the magnets that are being tested are much smaller than the magnets that need to be built? Indeed the only testing in process is on a model that is much smaller than the real size, and the scientists are just beginning now to custom build the first full-size magnets.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] for raising that question. In point of fact, of the 4-centimeter diameter magnet, several dozen full-scale magnets, the 50-foot long magnets were built. Those tested out above expectations. Scientists now are testing the 5-centimeter magnet. Five centimeters refer to the cross-section of the beam tube. These 5-centimeter magnets are short test magnets, approximately 12 feet long. These test magnets are being tested now, and are exceeding expectations, that is, they are exceeding the expected performance standard. There is absolutely no problem when you extend the test magnet from approximately 12 feet to 50 feet. The production magnets will work.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] will find that the testing that is now in process is on model magnets, not on the scale of those that will be required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WOLPE and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, those are not 50-foot long magnets, that is correct.

Mr. WOLPE. Indeed, they will be tested only in the string test next summer.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if I could reclaim my time, the point there is there is no technological challenge in going from a shorter magnet to a longer magnet. There is no new science, there is no risk factor. They are simply testing the smaller magnets first to make sure they get the basic technology down.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the real issue here is the mass production that will be required of the 8600 dipole magnets. The only example we have of anything mass produced of this approximate dimension was in Germany, where they mass produced some 450 magnets.

The issue is not only the technical ability to construct the size magnet required, but to mass produce these in a manner that will meet the costs and schedule that has been outlined by the proponents of the SSC. It is a very, very different magnitude of problem.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am glad the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] raised that point. Let me point out that the SSC laboratory has recently signed contracts with both Westinghouse and General Dynamics, fixed price contracts, under budget, to produce in quantity these magnets.

If the gentleman would care to look at this particular magnet, he will see that the actual design of the magnet is such that it can be mass produced. They actually have dies where they stamp out the parts and then assemble the parts in jigs that are very tightly controlled for exact quality tolerances.

There is not going to be any problem in building these magnets in quantity. It is designed to be built in quantity with existing technology.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, if this project is to go forward, I hope the prophecy offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] will prove accurate. The point that needs to be underscored is we are a long way from the production of full-sized magnets. We are even a much longer way from being able to mass produce these on time and under cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE]. I was talking about the cost argument. I was trying to point out there have been numerous cost estimates. The Department of Energy has reviewed those extensively. They feel very confident they can build this project for the \$8.25 billion estimate. That is a construction estimate, not an operational estimate. Some of the concerns that the opponents have raised deal with counting operational costs as construction costs.

I would like also to point out that within the \$8.25 billion cost estimate there is a contingency of \$843 million. In order to use that contingency the scientists and engineers that want to spend more money have to go to a work change committee. They have to present the case for increasing the expense of the project. That has already been done several times. The work change committee has yet to approve a cost increase of what is actually being done.

So if Members actually look at what is being done, not what might be done in the future, they will see that the SSC is being built according to the cost estimate that we have today.

I would also like to point out that there is a very unique management system in place for the SSC. There is a project manager who reports directly to the Secretary of Energy, and on site has full responsibility for all aspects of the project.

They have split the science and the engineering part of the project in two. They have a very competent construction manager who has built large-scale

projects in the past. He has total control over the cost of the project in terms of the nuts and bolts of it.

So if we look at the facts, the cost argument simply does not hold up.

Finally, let us talk about foreign contributions. There has been quite a bit of concern that none of these foreign contributions are coming in. I would refer my colleagues to the front page of the New York Times yesterday. The Japanese, who have committed \$2.5 billion I believe to the construction of the space station are now saying that obviously if we do not build the space station, that money is wasted, and because they cannot depend on America's commitments, signed agreements in terms of the space station, they may pull away from the SSC. We are hopeful that we may get as much as \$1 billion from the Japanese in foreign participation. If we do not make the statement on the floor of the House today, and on the floor of the Senate in the next month, that we are serious about building it, our foreign partners are going to back away.

We have to stay steady. That is why it is so important that we not accept the Slaterry amendment, the killer amendment. Let us defeat it like we have previous amendments in the past 3 years, and go ahead and build the project.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If I have time, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SLATTERY and by unanimous consent Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. One thing I would just observe is that when the gentleman talks about foreign commitments, whether it is Japan or any other country in the world, there is absolutely nothing that would prevent them from stepping forward right now and making their promises that if we built this at a certain cost that they are going to have X dollars, or yen, or marks, or francs on the barrel head. And the fact is that has not been done. That is one of the concerns that a lot of Members have, that we are going to commerce construction of this project, get 40 miles of the 53-mile trench dug, and suddenly the foreigners were waiting on say we have an emergency at home and are not going to provide the money we have promised. That is just one concern I have.

I would like to respond to the gentleman when he suggests that somehow this is on schedule from a cost and budget standpoint. The only reason that it is on schedule right now is, be-

cause the schedule has been changed by DOE. In January of this year they upped the cost of a couple billion dollars and said that is the budget.

It is easy to stay on schedule and budget if you continually amend the schedule and budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. SLATTERY and by unanimous consent Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to refuse the time, but due to my respect for the gentleman from Kansas, I will accept an additional minute and yield half of that time to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, oftentimes around here we use the word "gentleman" in a rather flippant way. But in this case when I say "the gentleman," I sincerely mean it. He is truly a gentleman.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Your time is counting.

Mr. SLATTERY. Yes; that is right.

The point I was going to make to the gentleman is that the schedule was changed earlier this year. They are on that schedule, at least they were until several weeks ago when the \$8.25 billion price tag was revised to the \$9.1 billion price tag. So it is continuing to change, and I do not know how the gentleman can make the argument that this project is anywhere near being done on schedule and on budget.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If I can reclaim the last 10 seconds of my time, I make that argument because it is the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ECKART and by unanimous consent Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, again, I accept the time with reservation. I am reminded of Abraham Lincoln's argument about the man about to be hung and how much he appreciated being the center of attention, but because of the situation at hand he would rather not be the center of attention. I feel like that. I am allowing myself to be put in that similar position. But I will accept the final 2 minutes so that my worthy opponents can have a little bit more time to attack me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Chairman, it is not the kill; sometimes it is the hunt that we enjoy.

To my colleague from Texas I would ask if he would identify for me the

numbers that he gave us at the beginning of his remarks about the increase in the research budgets in the Federal Government. I tried to take note of them but could not.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am happy to Xerox this and give it to the gentleman.

Mr. ECKART. Do those increases in research and development reflect all of the agencies of the Federal Government, or just research that the gentleman focused on some agencies?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, the numbers I read reflect only the civilian research budget of the various agencies. There is a section for defense research that I did not read.

Mr. ECKART. The gentleman did not include DOD numbers in that?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I did not.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the gentleman as a worthy adversary. Quite frankly, I fully believe were a lesser person advocating this project, it would not stand a chance, but the gentleman has done an outstanding job.

I want to point out on the question of foreign participants pulling away, they have never come to the table. We do not have any foreign participation.

Second, when the gentleman observes that there is no problem from his perspective, I must confess that is a Texas point of view, on magnet production, I would point out that the science adviser to the President, Dr. Bromley, has expressed serious reservations about the ability to mass produce magnets, and we are going to need 10,000 of these magnets.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If I can just respond to that point, those concerns by Dr. Bromley were in the past. I think as a consequence of some changes that have been made in the management of the magnet program he would not have those same concerns today.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I just would like to point out that next year's proposal, and this does not factor in the \$100 million cut this year, so next year's proposal is for \$638 million. We assume they are going to try to make up the \$100 million, and the following year \$710 million, then \$728 million, and \$733 million, and it keeps going up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important debate, and I hope very much that all of the Members will seriously con-

sider the exchanges that have been taking place here.

I am in a rather peculiar position in that two of the most valued Members of the committee which I chair are leading the effort to secure passage of this amendment, the chairman of our Oversight Subcommittee Mr. WOLPE of Michigan and the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee Mr. BOEHLERT of New York. If any Members had any doubts that our committee was going to do a vigorous oversight job, I think that those doubts would be dispelled by the vigor with which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] have taken on this project. They have done so with a great deal of background information. They have held hearings. They have reviewed numerous reports, and I would commend their comments and their criticism to all of the Members of the House.

I have to say that having reviewed their work, and admired it, as a matter of fact, I do not come to the same conclusion which they have reached with regard to eliminating the superconducting super collider. I have to tell Members first of all that there is no doubt in the scientific community of the value of this project. There is some division within the scientific community as to the apportionment of funds between large science projects such as this and smaller projects which are in the province of individual investigators or small teams.

It is my opinion in the case of the superconducting super collider that this division within the scientific community is not all that meritorious, since the management of this project has made a very real effort to make sure that there was the widest possible involvement of scientists throughout the country in the development of this project.

□ 1540

There are other important factors that need to be considered here. There is some real doubt as to whether this country is going to have the stamina and the determination to carry out any large-scale research and development projects, and I think that this is something that we need to consider very, very carefully.

The figures given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] with regard to our investments in research and development are accurate, and he cited them in order to put in perspective the amount that we are spending on the superconducting super collider.

What he did not say, and which I am going to say here, and I am going to say it many, many times in the future, is that our investment in civilian research and development measured as a percentage of our gross national product is two-thirds of what the Japanese

are investing and about the same fraction of what the Germans are investing. We cannot continue to be world leaders in science, in technology, in the development and commercialization of advanced technology as long as we continue to underinvest in the fundamental research and development that is central to the development of all advanced technologies.

I think you all know that. I think you know that the reason that we have lost our leadership in global trade and high technology is that we have underinvested in the basic underlying knowledge on which these technologies are created.

Now, what this amendment proposes to do is to make another serious cut in that investment, and it is not the only cut which we will consider as additional appropriations bills are brought before us.

I applaud the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water, the gentleman from Alabama, for attempting to maintain this project, even though not at full funding, and to carry it forward.

The Committee on Appropriations is faced with some very, very tough choices, and other subcommittees in making those tough choices have chosen to eliminate major programs such as the space station. I regret that, and I will do my best to obtain reconsideration of that action on the floor.

But the fact is that, under the pressure that we see facing us because of the budget, we are cutting at the heart of our investments in fundamental research, and we are doing this to the danger of our future as a leader in the world.

I think it would be erroneous to say that the superconducting super collider will not have problems. I do not know of any major project that does not have problems. I could point to the many such projects in the Defense Department which have had similar problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate times, we discussed these failures on the part of big defense programs to come in on schedule and under budget, and it is regrettable when these things happen, but they do.

We do not quite so often hear about the problems in some of the social programs. Last month, for example, it was indicated that the cost of the Medicaid Program is going to be \$10 billion more than what we expected last year. Now, this is not a big research program. We ought to be able to compute what it is going to cost us, but we do not. We make mistakes.

This project will not come in precisely at the level that we expect. That

is why it has a 10-percent contingency fund in it as has been indicated, and we hope it will come in within that 10-percent contingency, but we cannot be sure. I do not think that that is critical.

When we voted to start this project several years ago, we knew what the problems in big science were, and we presumably agreed to accept those when we voted to go ahead.

I had hoped that this project would be built in California, and, of course, that would have made it a much better project, but it was not. It was built in Texas. But I am convinced that if we cannot maintain our commitment to support these high-priority, advanced-science, state-of-the-art, world-class projects, that it strikes a blow at our leadership in the world in the future.

I am not going to renege on that kind of a commitment. We are, of course, in a very bad deficit position. We are undoubtedly going to be over \$300 billion in debt.

Does that mean that we have to cut out primarily the advanced basic research programs? No, it does not. You know as well as I do that we waste hundreds of billions of dollars.

Again, I cite a recent report on the paperwork cost of Medicare, \$100 billion per year. You could finance an awful lot of science programs to the benefit of this Nation by the savings you could make in the paperwork cost of Medicare.

The question is: Where are our priorities? I can tell you that unless we reverse our priorities in the areas of research and development, this Nation will continue to decline as a world leader. I think we may already have started that process of decline, regrettably. We do not make the proper priority choices. You do not make proper priority choices when you weigh a space station against the cost of veterans' care, for example. That is a very tough choice to make, and I sympathize very much with the subcommittee decision to sacrifice the space station. It was the wrong decision, but I understand how they could have come to it.

What I am telling the Members is we have got to get our priorities straight. We have got to support the things that are important to the future of this country, to our children and our grandchildren. An investment in basic research is one of those things.

What is likely to do more damage to the prospects of the superconducting super collider than anything else has already been referred to, the fact that our international prospective partners will not be partners unless they feel we are dependable partners, and they do not feel that at the present time. They do not feel we have a commitment to carry out these large-scale science projects, and the space station is going to be the perfect illustration of that.

You will not get Japanese participation, you will not get European participation if you fail to fund the programs that we have already asked them to share in and they have agreed to share. If we cancel them, we will not get them to share in the superconducting super collider. That is the biggest threat that faces us, and I lay it out for you.

This is not simple. It is complex. The whole process of making choices is going to be difficult. One decision will have a ripple effect on another decision.

We have to think through where we want to go as a country. If we do not do that, we are in serious trouble.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my chairman and say how proud I am to serve on the committee under his leadership.

I could not agree more with the gentleman's eloquent comments about the need to invest more in science, because investments in science are investments in America's future.

But you are so right, Mr. Chairman, when you say that we have to prioritize, and I look at what we are proposing for the superconducting super collider, and I analyze it.

Is this a high-priority item? My conclusion is, no, and I point out that, for example, what we are asking for the superconducting super collider would fund the National Institutes for Standards and Technology for a quarter of a century, 25 years. It would fund the National Science Foundation for 5 years. It would fund all of those researchers who are standing in line at the National Institutes of Health.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. BOEHLERT and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman not to take all of this 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I will tell the chairman that I will not.

I could not agree with the gentleman more on the need to assign priorities. We have gone through a painstaking process in our Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight, and we have come to conclusions, not by the seat of our pants, but after very thoughtful deliberation, and our conclusion is, while this may be good science, it is not high-priority science, "and you ain't seen nothing yet in terms of the cost."

Mr. BROWN. As I said earlier, I have a great deal of respect for my distinguished colleague, and he is quite right in almost everything he said with the minor exception of his conclusion.

For one thing, in setting the priorities among science projects, I would be much more swayed by the gentleman's argument if any of this money that is saved would go to other science projects. None of it does. None of it. It will go into something else. It does not help our science posture as a result of that.

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is exactly what we tried to do. We were operating under a gag rule. We went with the gentleman's blessing to the Committee on Rules, but we were turned down summarily. We could not get the waiver that everyone else got.

Mr. BROWN. I understand. And this is a part of the other problem I referred to. We handcuff ourselves by our own procedures in the Congress in making the proper kind of priority decisions.

I am going to call this to the attention of my good friends on the Committee on Appropriations many times over.

□ 1550

We are not allowed to make the proper priority choices as the result of the procedures that we are under.

I want to humbly ask the Committee on Appropriations to allow a little participation—not very much, but a little—on the part of the authorizing committee to try to achieve the more rational priority choices we have to make in the future.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the chairman that this gentleman certainly shares your commitment to the need for scientific research in this country. I understand how important that is to the future economic competitiveness of our country.

I would point out to the gentleman, the question is, do we gain most from spending our money in this project called the superconducting super collider; or can we take that money, \$4.34 billion, and give it to 100 different projects, a hundred different universities perhaps around the country, and in 10 or 15 years from now we are going to be better off with the super collider, or with the money spent on the smaller science projects?

History has taught citizens very clearly that small science nets the United States greater yield over a period of time. That is where the gentleman is coming from.

We are not arguing over whether we should invest more in scientific research. I support that. What we are discussing is, where and how it can best be invested for the benefit of our country over the long term.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support, and I know we can count on it in the future.

However, as I pointed out earlier, the gentleman will not necessarily get this money that is being cut out of superconducting super collider going into small science projects. If just disappears.

I have come to the conclusion, and it is not an easy conclusion, that on balance we need to keep our commitments, we need to support a balanced program with small science and large science. This is part of such a balanced program, and that we need to be firm and constant in our support of our research and development investments.

Therefore, I ask Members to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Slatery amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is difficult to deal with an issue like this for many Members of Congress. There is a great deal of politics being played over the superconducting super collider, and that is the way the system works.

However, for those Members who are considering switching their vote on the superconducting super collider, let me give those Members perhaps a few reasons that they might want to consider it. One, we are in a recession right now, and at the same time we are in a race for our economic lives. The global battleground is technology. Really, the battlefield that we need to focus on is the transfer of technology for our companies, our small, our medium-sized, and our large companies. That is where we are losing out as a nation.

Now, the Federal research and development economy is about \$70 billion big. Over the years, it has been driven by agencies of missions that exist to this day. That may need to change a little bit, but they are tough to change. They have been driven by the idea that science, if we invest in it, through this great big funnel, eventually comes out into technology, which eventually gets applied in the marketplace, which means jobs and economic growth.

I submit to Members that the whole model of the Federal R&D economy, \$70 billion strong, does not reflect the demand, the need of our industry, of our workers, of our jobs, in this global economic battleground.

Mr. Chairman, in the period of decline of the British Empire, they were winning Nobel Prizes left and right, but that is not winning market share. We are investing in the very basic of basic, basic science when it comes to the superconducting super collider. Who knows what happens 20, 30, 40 years from now. Maybe the next smallest particle after the quark will do something for our autoworkers or for our electronic industry, but no person can really connect the two.

This is the wrong investment for America. It is coming at the wrong

time. We are in a deficit in the Federal budget. We are in a deficit in our competitiveness. Here we are investing in a great wonderful, and I do not deny the scientific high energy physics merits of this project, they are all there. However, do we really have a problem in high energy physics in America? Is that what is keeping our workers from competing in Cleveland or Bethlehem? No. The investments that we need to make are much, much closer to reality. That reality is getting the technology out there, at the cutting edge, underpinning our companies and their workers in the global competitive battle. It is transferring technology to our small- and medium-sized business and manufacturers in a way that the Federal Government accelerates, getting on-the-shelf technology off the shelf, and into our companies, and supporting our workers now.

These are the kind of things that we need to do a lot more of. Do we need a superconducting super collider at this point in our history? I listened to the arguments for 3 to 4 years. No Member has come up with an assessment of our needs that fits this superconducting super collider.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RITTER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. RITTER. Initially, when in the Subcommittee on Science that first authorized the superconducting super collider, we had a debate over whether this thing was going to be helpful for America and what it was going to do for America.

I have to tell Members that in a survey of American industry, the Industrial Research Institute, which represents about 1.5 trillion dollars' worth of production of goods and services to go all over the world, there was no support for a superconducting super collider. There was not any support in the industry. Oh, yes, the Members will say that there are companies that support it. However, they are contractors. They stand to benefit directly.

It is almost impossible to get an American company to come out front, saying that they think this is a priority for America, when they are faced with a competitive challenge that each day gives them heartburn, and if we ask them whether they, their workers, or their communities are going to benefit in any way, shape, or form by a superconducting super collider, they will laugh.

We know how the system works around here. We get there the fastest with the mostest political support, and we can make just about anything happen. We can almost make hell freeze over.

However, let Members stand back. The gentleman from Kansas has offered Members an opportunity to re-think priorities. We have a chance to do something about it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who has done such yeoman service on behalf of the superconducting super collider.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment that the gentleman's comment about the many industries and companies not being supportive of the SSC.

I have a letter dated May 24 that has about 60 companies listed on it, and one of the companies is called Air Products & Chemicals. Is the gentleman in the well familiar with that company?

□ 1600

Mr. RITTER. Is the gentleman asking if I am familiar with the company in my own district? Of course, I am familiar with it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wanted to ask if the gentleman had heard of that company. They are supportive of the project.

Mr. RITTER. Well, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that there are a lot of companies who are contractors, but if you go beyond the contractors, if you go beyond the universities that will benefit, if you go beyond the great spread of projects all over America, there is no support.

We are doing this here because the I and G Physics Committee—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RITTER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. RITTER. We are doing this, Mr. Chairman, because a great coalition has been formed. It is a very powerful coalition. Just look at the votes that have been mobilized over the past several Congresses.

But I ask those Members who may think that our country does have a problem with competing overseas, think about priorities. The chairman talked about priorities. Think about priorities and think whether this is a priority for America at this time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to any amendments to the energy and water appropriations for fiscal year 1992 that would cut funding for the superconducting super collider below levels established in the committee's bill.

The debate on these amendments is about whether we should be spending Government funds on high-technology research and development. And the debate is about whether the SSC is a useful and cost-effective way to spend scarce R&D resources.

I strongly believe that the SSC will prove to be a cost-effective use of our dollars. Is there risk? Yes, there is. But it is risk we must be willing to take if we expect to stake a claim to international economic competitiveness in the 21st century.

Already more than 90 universities and research facilities are conducting SSC research. We already have magnetic resonance imaging for medical diagnosis as a result of this research. This will save lives and produce commercial sales at home and abroad.

I urge my colleagues to think about this: There are precious few areas of the Federal budget where we have the discretion to decide between spending for our own present consumption and spending as an investment in our future. Looking at our budgets as a whole, an objective observer in the 21st century will wonder why we selfishly spent today with so little regard for tomorrow.

The committee has wrestled long and hard with these issues and has already cut \$100 million from the President's budget request for SSC. These ill-advised amendments would circumvent the committee's careful prioritizing. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendments.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Chairman, in order to be an effective Member of this body you must have a vision of the future. There are those whose vision of this project is that it is very expensive, that it costs too much; but there are many pluses to this project. Just think 30 years ago of the arguments that this body had on their vision of putting a man on the Moon. Many people thought it was too expensive, but look at what we have benefited from that investment.

I do not look at the super collider as a cost factor, but an investment, an investment in the future.

Imagine what it could do by compressing energy. Our kids will be able to see a battery about this size that will have enough energy to operate an automobile. One a little larger will provide enough energy to heat and cool our homes.

Look what it could do to the medical industry where you could stand in front of an x-ray machine that can find any tumors or cancers in your body without ever using a knife.

The Japanese have developed a Dick Tracy watch, a watch that has a telephone in it, but they cannot put it on the market because they do not have a battery small enough to develop that watch.

We would be able to develop many, many industries, many opportunities in the future by compressing energy.

So I encourage the Members not to vote for this amendment, to look at it

not as a cost factor, but as investment in our children.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me if I may just take a minute and then let some other Members discuss some of the aspects of this project; but from the standpoint of the benefits of the super collider and some of the questions that have been asked today, good questions, questions that need to be debated on the floor of this body, but I would like to just draw the attention of my colleagues to the medical aspects, the potential medical technology that can and will come from the development of the SSC by looking to particle accelerators in the past and what they mean today in the area of diagnostic medicine, particle accelerators that were once used for basic research just as the SSC will be used for basic research today treats cancer, study the origin of headaches and let doctors look inside the human body for diagnosis and PET scans and CAT scans. All this technology is the direct result of particle physics and particle physics research.

At the Fermi Lab, the University of Illinois Medical School uses a particle beam line for their neutrino cancer therapy facility.

SQUIDS is a new technology utilizing superconducting magnets, those magnets that are being developed in this project which doctors are using to detect electrical waves in the brain to determine the cause of headaches and other neurological disorders. Accelerators are being used to generate thin x-rays which are beamed at the AIDS virus to study its structure and determine its characteristics.

In just the R&D stage of the SSC, industry has been able to improve the current-carrying capability of the superconducting cable, which is a key component of the magnets, then take that technology and that advanced cable to lead to improved medical diagnostic magnets and magnetic resonance imaging, technologies and spin-offs that occurred just this year, which will allow doctors to get a detailed picture of the inner workings of the human body without surgery.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me just simply say that when we look to the future and our vision of America and the vision of education, science, and technology, when we look at the kinds of jobs we want to create, the kinds of medical diagnosis we want to have, there is nothing that we could be doing better than spending our resources on this kind of research and development.

The world's most powerful accelerator, the SSC, promises to continue this dynamic technology.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. SLATTERY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAPMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I listened carefully to the gentleman's comments about the advantages that could be derived from this for medical purposes. I would just point out to the gentleman that the scientists from Bell Labs have had the opportunity over the Senate to respond to this point, and they have made it very clear that the advantages and the discoveries dealing with MRI and some of the things the gentleman referred to have, in fact, resulted from research in the physical sciences, no question about it, but not from this kind of research that will be done in accelerators.

I think it is very important for the body to understand that. That is coming from the people at the Bell Laboratory.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, but let me just say that the new advances this year in magnetic resonance imaging were the direct result of the SSC R&D. I am not familiar with what someone from Bell Labs has said. I am familiar with the spinoffs and the research so far on SSC and what it is going to mean to diagnostic medicine in the future of this country.

□ 1610

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I point out a lot of this research is going to continue with or without the SSC, and I suggest it continue without the SSC.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I do not pretend to be a scientist or an expert in this kind of technology, but perhaps I can share with you a story that personalizes the potential of this kind of research to average Americans.

Fundamentally, the same kind of research was done at the Fermi Lab where a superconducting super collider process was used. A cancer treatment program was developed there, making the point of the importance of this kind of fundamental research. In my own district in California at Loma Linda University, a building has been completed which itself, becomes a superconducting super collider on a very small scale.

Apparently, in these experiments this is what some of these experts learned they could do: The hydrogen atom, when spun around the superconducting super collider at very rapid speeds, crashes together and the proton comes off. Apparently, the hydrogen proton is able to receive very high concentrations of radiation.

Currently, when one is being treated for cancer by way of radiation, often the greatest difficulty is that tissue is treated directly and, following that tissue's treatment, there is a flash point of heat that kills other tissue or organs, and people die from that radiation rather than purely from cancer.

This proton concentration process allows one to treat people in a different fashion. You take a particle with high concentrations of high radiation and rifle it at the same kind of tissue. There is no flash point on the other side, therefore additional organs are not killed, people do not die.

They believe they will be able to save as many as 90 percent of those who currently die from such cancer treatment. I do not pretend to be an expert about the way this technology works, but I do know this: A young woman in my district recently was advised in several circumstances that in order to save her life they had to remove her eye. She went through this treatment, and it appears that her eye will be saved. Indeed, technology can be very esoteric and still have very practical results. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I rise to suggest to the House and say that the House and the Congress can well afford to continue expanding this type of research and development.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first let me salute the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BEVILL. He has a heavy burden to carry with this appropriation. We are proud of the work that he and Mr. MYERS have done. I hope that this debate, this spirited debate on an important issue, will not detract from the fine work which they have done in putting together a very, very difficult appropriation bill.

I also at this point want to commend the gentleman from Waxahachie, whom fate has dealt the awesome responsibility to serve this House as defender of the SSC. It is a heavy burden.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If I may interrupt, it is pronounced Waxahachie.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman. I never can quite get the Texas pronunciation.

Let me mention a few things: Before crushing its first proton, the super collider will crush our Federal science budget. Look at what we said last year in passing the authorization bill with 309 votes. We said to the super collider and all their supporters, "We are going to give you \$5 billion in Federal money

and nothing more. If you can't do it with \$5 billion, stop the project."

That language passed this House overwhelmingly. It is a sensible instruction to people who have the responsibility of managing this awesome project.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not take up that authorization bill. Our will was worked, but it did not become law. It does not govern the project. For the people supporting the super collider today, it is probably a good thing it does not, because of the estimates coming in on the cost of the super collider. As you have heard during the course of this debate we have gone from \$4.4 billion to \$8 billion to \$11 billion to where we don't know. It is an open-ended commitment. I think that is what brings the gentleman from Kansas to the floor today with this amendment, and that is why we think it is important that it be debated.

What does it mean if we press on with the super collider regardless of cost? Well, let us quote the associate director from the office of the super collider, a gentleman by the name of Gary Gibbs, who in testimony on May 9 of this year, and I quote:

While some growth in high-energy physics program funding from present levels will be necessary to support a productive and balanced U.S. high-energy physics program which includes the SSC, it is likely that priority choices will have to be made and the operation of some existing facilities will have to be reduced or phased out.

What he is saying, ladies and gentlemen, and what has been verified by Nobel laureate Leon Lederman, is that if we are going to put our eggs in the super collider basket, that we will necessarily have to close down other science projects.

Now, I have heard my friend from California [Mr. LEWIS] and my friend from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] come to sing the praises of the research that has emanated from the Fermi Lab in Chicago. I have a soft spot in my heart for Fermi Lab not only because it is in my home State but also because as a college student I worked in Illinois to secure the funding so that we could move forward with the Fermi Lab.

But keep in mind, with all the praise you are hearing on the Fermi Lab, that the chairman of this subcommittee was faced with the prospect of closing down new-start construction at this Fermi Lab this year because the super collider would consume so many Federal dollars. If we are to press forward at the Fermi Lab with even more advances, we have got to step back and assess whether we can afford to put the massive investment necessary to complete the super collider.

This year, the chairman of the subcommittee was faced with the prospect of eliminating all new starts because of the voracious appetite of the super collider, this gourmand of Federal dol-

lars; in fact, even cutting back on projects in his own home State, I am sure near and dear to his constituents.

But that is what it would cost this year. And if we press forward without a price tag on this project, what will it cost next year? I fear that it will go beyond new starts, new construction; that next year we will be cutting the operating budgets of the Federal laboratories across the United States. The second point I would like to make is that this Texas gila monster with a 54-mile tail snaps up every Federal dollar in sight. If we hang onto the super collider with an unknown price tag, we are going to see in each successive year for the next 10 years the majority of new Federal dollars heading toward Texas, heading toward this one project.

Let me give an example this year, an early year in the project: This subcommittee got \$480 million, new dollars, for Federal scientific research. When it was all over, \$198 million of it went to the super collider, over 40 percent.

If we continue that pace, it will necessarily take away from science projects of great merit across the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. This has been a long debate, and I do not want to take any longer than 1 additional minute.

Before we sink the first shovel in that Waxahachie hole, let us stop and hold the President and this administration to a standard of fiscal accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote to support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that back in 1987 and 1988 there was an ad hoc working group of Members from California, Illinois, Texas, Colorado, and New Mexico that used to meet every Thursday morning or once a month on Thursday mornings to try to help advocate the project. Now, my recollection is that Congresswoman Lynn Martin, now Secretary of Labor, was a part of that group, and I seem to recall the gentleman in the well was part of that group. Is that true or not true? If it is true, what has changed the gentleman's mind about supporting the project?

Mr. DURBIN. Two things changed my mind: First, the cost of it has gone out of control. Second, the anticipated foreign contributions have not materialized.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. But it is true that you were in support of the project?

Mr. DURBIN. I certainly did support the concept. But, frankly, I am sure the gentleman would not say that he would be for this concept at any cost. That is what we are faced with now.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am a somewhat reluctant supporter of SSC, I will admit to that. I was not sure at the outset that it was the right thing to do. I was not sure it was the right place in which to commit vast amounts of Federal dollars needed for research in this country. But the fact is whether that view was right or not, it was not the view that prevailed. The view that prevailed by fairly overwhelming numbers in this Congress was that this is a project that we should do and that we should move forward with it. We have already invested several hundred million dollars in it, and we will invest much more in it in the future, there is no doubt about that.

But the question we have to begin to ask ourselves on some of these projects is: How often are we going to start down the road only to pull back and lose everything?

□ 1620

We are doing that regularly in this body, and it seems to be focusing on science, technology, and on science research. It seems that consistently now, whether it be in defense areas or in civilian areas, this Congress starts down the road, invests billions of dollars, in some cases, in projects, only to say after we get well into them, "Sorry, guys, that's it. We don't want to spend any more money."

As a result, Mr. Chairman, we lose all of the money that was spent on the project up until that point, and then we lose the final results.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is on projects like SSC we are taking substantial risks. The gentlemen who have raised questions about the project here today are exactly right. This is a risky project.

However, Mr. Chairman, I say, "You can't get good science results unless you take high risks. The risks have to be enormous in order to get enormous results, and sometimes you don't get the results you want. In fact, you fail, and that's one reason why the Government is doing these big science projects, not private enterprise, because you're doing highly risky things."

But the fact of the matter is that once we commit to some of these, we ought to follow through, and in this particular case that is what this committee is talking about. They are talking about following through.

Now I would have preferred, I say to my colleagues, the opportunity to come to the floor and endorse what the authorizing committee did last year. The authorizing committee was absolutely right last year. There is a point at which the Government should invest no more money in this project, and what the authorizing committee felt after the deliberations was at that point it was \$5 billion, and we ought to invest \$5 billion in the project, and that is it. Other than that, the Energy Department ought to go out and find foreign partners. We ought to find the money for additional investment there.

It is my understanding that the authors of this amendment sought to come to the floor to do exactly that. It was to cap it where the authorizers said we would be last year. That was turned down. I think that is a real shame.

Mr. Chairman, I think the processes in the House that do not permit us to make rational judgments that have been made through a hearing process in the authorizing framework just makes no sense at all, and it would be very, very useful today to be able to be on the floor, capping this project at a reasonable level and assuring for the future that the work that is being done is being done within a very, very appropriate framework. That is what we should be doing here today. I would support that.

But I also would say to all of the folks who have decided that the only option open to them, not having gotten that amendment, to kill the project completely does not make sense either because the science research budgets of this country are extremely important to the future of this country. I have heard cited the fact that we have had these massive hundreds of billions of dollars of deficits. I think I have a strong enough record that maybe I can come to the floor and talk in terms of addressing deficits. I will do it on all areas that are appropriate. But let me tell my colleagues something.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "The thing is that somewhere along the line, when you're spending deficit money, it ought to be invested somewhere. If you're going to spend these deficits, and we're going to do it, some of that money ought to get invested somewhere so that the people who are in the end paying interest payments on the debt that we're racking up in fact benefit from it."

Now where we are going to benefit is on some of the science research we are doing. They are the people who will really take the benefits from this, and when we are investing it in food stamps and social welfare, the fact is we are eating up all that money, and those future generations see nothing from that, and we spend all that money, and we spend it in hundreds and billions of dollar globs, but, when it comes to a few

billion for science research, then all of a sudden that is where we want to pull back, and consistently this Congress is finding the places they want to cut are in science, and I think that is a shame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. RITTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his leadership on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and I do sympathize with his point about starting up something, and then curtailing it, and starting up something else, and curtailing it, and often this happens in the science area, and we are just witnessing right now what is going on with the space station.

The gentleman made a very important point. He said that this project, this SSC project, was extremely risky. He is right. But the superconducting super collider project was never intended to be a high-risk research project. It was supposed to be a construction project.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, when it was sold to the Congress at \$4.4 billion, it was sold as follows:

You had to dig a great big hole, and you had to provide 53 miles in circumference of magnets.

Nobody really questioned whether we could mass produce the magnets, and now, all of a sudden, we are wondering whether or not we will be able to mass produce 53 miles in circumference in magnets. Each one is 54 feet long, 17 feet in diameter, has to operate at superconducting temperatures of liquid helium.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is absolutely correct. It is a high-risk project. It is a research project, not a construction project.

So, the whole idea of caps and somehow coming up with a projected number or figure at this stage of the game does not fit with the experience of a science project.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for pointing that out, but I would still say to the gentleman that there is, I think, a reasonable level of expectation that the Federal Government, investing \$5 billion in this project, would have made the right level of investment and that others who want to share in the research and some one could come in with the additional moneys, and it might well cost well more than that, but the point is

what we would be doing is seeking international cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, all I am saying to the gentleman is that I do not think that anybody ever kidded me about the nature of the project. Sure, it was a construction project, but we are doing things that nobody has ever done before, and that is exactly what we ought to be investing in if we are investing in real basic science research.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that, if we were talking about \$5 billion here today in terms of Federal exposure, I think the debate would be entirely different, but the fact is by the most conservative, optimistic estimates of cost we are up to \$5.6 billion right now, and that assumes that we are going to get \$1.7 billion from foreign sources. It assumes \$1 billion from Texas, and the Texans have been good to their word. They put the billion dollars up in effect, but we do not have anywhere near the \$1.7 billion from foreign sources. All we have is about \$40 million.

Mr. WALKER. No, I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, I would just point out that again, if we were talking about a \$5 billion cap, which the gentleman suggested that he would support, and this gentleman tried to convince the Committee on Rules—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SLATTERY and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that this gentleman and others tried to convince the Committee on Rules to allow us to put the \$5 billion cap in place. I, for one, believe that would in effect be a killer amendment. We were denied that primarily because the supporters of the project opposed giving us that opportunity.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that, and I say to the gentleman from Kansas, "The one reason though why the foreign competitors or foreign allies have not come forward for the money is they believe that Uncle Sugar is going to pay for the whole thing and they're going to get the benefits from it without having invested any money.

If in fact what you did was put a cap on it and force the Energy Department to go out and aggressively come up with some foreign money, I think that it would be more likely to be brought into the works."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman further yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing now that would prevent the Department of Energy and this administration from going to all the foreign sources that might be possible donors to this project and securing commitments from them contingent upon this Congress stepping forward and doing what it agreed to do last year, and that is put up \$5 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to finish up the point.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is absolutely correct.

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. But the reason for that is because the Department of Energy also believes we are going to come up with the money. The Department of Energy has had no real encouragement to go out and aggressively try to find foreign money. They believe also that this project can be done fully, and, let me tell my colleagues that there are people in the Congress who have encouraged them to believe that because there are people in the Congress who have suggested to them, for instance, that we can go out and talk to the foreigners, but we cannot talk to them at all about magnet technology because we want to reserve that exclusively for ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, that puts a fairly big hindrance in negotiating with foreign partners. The big thing that we are going to learn from this project is magnets, and if in fact we are going to keep all that to ourselves, there is not much incentive for foreigners to come in. If in fact we made a real commitment to having international cooperation on this and international financing, then it would be a joint project in which everybody would share but where we would receive a good bit of money in return.

□ 1630

We have not done any of that, and I would say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] that in my view, if we put a \$5 billion cap on it, that we would end up doing the right kind of things and we would end up with both the project and with the knowledge base that grew out of the project. So I think the cap would work very well.

I am sorry that we did not get to debate the cap. I do not think it is a killer amendment at all; I think it is a very, very legitimate way of proceeding with a very high-risk technology project.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The fact is, we do not have a cap. We do not have a cap. This project is open-ended.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. Because we do not have a cap is not the reason to kill it either. It seems to me that what we want to do is find a process by which we cap the cost but we also keep the project alive. This amendment does not take the middle ground on that. It simply says, "Kill the project completely."

I think that is the wrong approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

(On request of Mr. RITTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is one of the leaders on this whole issue of the cap. We have not been successful in achieving a cap because everybody knows a cap will not work. And if we put a cap on it, we are dead. Then we will really be in a hole, having spent a lot of money and not able to go any further. The foreign countries have not committed a dime. There are some in-kind commitments for researchers from India. There is no multibillion dollar interest out there in this project because they do not see it as a priority.

Even Japan, which is floating in American dollars, which could do this at any point in time, does not see it as an investment. They would rather invest in superconductivity itself. They would rather invest in ceramics and biotechnology.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], not everybody believes that a cap will not work. I think a cap would work. I think that it is a viable way of proceeding with this project. It is too bad we did not have a chance to deal with it here on the floor today.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I cannot fulfill this debate nearly so eloquently as my good colleague from Pennsylvania, but I do want to take a few minutes to offer my insights. Before I do, I would like to pay tribute to the chairman of my committee, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, who brought up a very important issue which is

leadership in the science community. I also would like to thank and commend the committee for all their hard work on this bill. They have crafted a superior piece of legislation in this time of tight budgetary constraint.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. WOLPE. I generally support basic scientific research, and I believe that this country can be a leader in this area. With everything else that we do, we must receive a reasonable return on our investment.

Before I came to Congress, I worked as an architect and a builder. And builders in the private sector typically try to control change orders so that construction cost overruns do not exceed 3 percent on any given project.

It is outrageous that this program's total cost estimates already have increased by more than 80 percent. In other words, in 5 years the cost has risen by \$4.1 billion, with an escalation of \$850 million in just the last 4 months. Who knows how much higher the costs could go? The most important part of this project is the magnets. We do not even know if they will work and how much they will cost, and so we might be faced with even greater increases. We need to look at responsible management in this country, especially in the scientific community.

Leadership lies not only in the vision but in the clarity of that vision. We need to establish management and setting priorities as a way of clarifying our vision in the science community.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unreasonable for the American people to expect that their tax dollars be used effectively and efficiently. And with the superconducting super collider, unfortunately this is not the case. How high will the costs for the SSC go?

A program with cost overruns like this would be cut in the private sector, and that is exactly what Congress should do. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. ECKART and Mr. WOLPE to eliminate funding for this superconducting super collider. The savings, totaling \$390 million, will reduce the deficit. But in addition to that, the elimination of funding for SSC will save the American taxpayers billions of dollars in future spending.

As has been mentioned here, the growth in spending on this item has been monumental in just the past number of years and months.

Mr. Chairman, beyond the need to prioritize spending, questions remain about the SSC. Just recently the GAO called on the Congress to withhold funding for construction until management problems are corrected, and if we fail to proceed with this kind of management oversight, the SSC will literally be a worthless \$10 billion 54-mile tunnel. At some point arguments will be made that it is too late to stop, too much has already been expended.

Let us take a page from the B-2 bomber and other boondoggles and turn this funding spigot off before the trickle of money turns into a torrent that overwhelms our ability to stop it.

Today is the time to stop funding before we dig a tunnel of debt.

If I might shift gears, I want to make it clear that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and myself and others have formed a bipartisan group to analyze appropriation measures as they come before the floor. We are not offering a separate amendment today because we felt it important to join in support of the Slattery-Eckart-Wolpe amendment.

The budget agreement last fall did not include provision that abdicates congressional responsibility to root out wasteful spending. The amendment before us eliminating SSC funding is a perfect example of what needs to be done to stop wasteful spending. This is an unauthorized project and it fits the definition of those types of spending items that Mr. UPTON and I will try to root out as appropriation bills are brought before this body in the future.

I urge adoption of the Slattery-Eckart-Wolpe amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman to draw on his experiences as an architect concerning these cost estimates and relate this, if he would, to this project.

I would like to ask the gentleman, as an architect, if I came to you and asked you to build a project or to design a project and the first thing I told you is it had never been built before and that it would have technologies that did not exist at the time I asked you to design it, and I cannot even tell you where it is going to be, would it surprise you if there were some change orders that came along the way during the process of the design, of the construction of that project under those circumstances? Because as the gentleman has asked about the last 5 years, that has been precisely the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BARTON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SWETT

was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, If the gentleman will yield further, in other words, to condemn the Department of Energy for a cost estimate that was 5 years ago when they did not know where it was going to be built at the time; Texas did not win the site competition until November of 1988. This project, this collider has never been built. There is not one like it anywhere in the world and it involves technology that did not exist at the time it was conceived.

So I would just ask the gentleman, as an architect, if I had given him a building project with those same parameters, would he be surprised to see in the development of the final design and the location and the technology that there would be some cost changes?

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a very pertinent question. The experience that I have in the professional world is that when posed with a project such as this major, we break the expense into two separate compartments. One is the design cost and the second is the construction cost. And the two are negotiated separately.

Essentially, when we go into construction, we are looking at a complete set of documents with a location and the prerequisite permits for the construction of that facility. In this case, we were operating with the two processes combined, which is my understanding. And I think that is where the project fell into the deep, dark hole that it now finds itself in. I believe that we ought to revisit the design portion of this and there ought to be caps, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to earlier, and that they ought to be specifically addressing the design portion of this.

If we are going to get into construction, that is a separate matter that ought to be put under a construction cap. There is a fixed bid, and we ought to stay under those cost constraints.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may say, I think the gentleman makes my point from the standpoint that it has just been recently that the final cost estimates have been arrived at and the contracts let since that time, according to the best information we have, have both been on or under budget. The project is on schedule, both from the design and the construction part of it.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just point out that that budget and those schedules have been altered, and what has not changed is the basic design of the project. Typically in a construction designed and built project, your budget alters when the design of the project incorporates new and additional information, expanded scope, changes in that nature.

□ 1640

At this point in time we are looking at the same project we started out with, and yet we are moving schedule, we are moving budget, and I find that to be irresponsible management. That is one reason why I have no confidence that the appropriations we are seeking today are the cap, and that we are probably going to end up with a project double what we are asking for at this point in time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I appreciate his comments. I think, though, that the record would reflect that the actual design of the SSC technically and to some extent is still evolving, but the actual design, the size of the tunnel, for example, has changed just within the last year, so the evolution of the design, there has been an evolution of the design since 1985 or 1986. I am simply saying that because since the design has been approved, since DOE has done the independent cost estimates, the project is on schedule and under budget. I would just like to point that out.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] will also let me reiterate, when one designs a project and when one builds a project, we are looking at two different phases. We have mish-mashed this whole thing together and put ourselves in a position where I believe there is no responsibility toward the construction budget, because no one has any real idea of what the design of this is actually going to end up being.

With that irresponsible approach, I believe we are looking at a budget that is going to continue to grow, and the design will continue to move around, until we end up doubling, not to the \$9 billion we are looking at today, but we will be closer to \$18 billion. That, in my mind, is the greatest fear that I have for the taxpayers of this good country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the energy and water development appropriations bill. Included in this important measure are two items that are of great concern to the people of the Third District.

Of course, this bill continues the strong support of the Richmond Floodwall Program. I am pleased to announce that this body's confidence in the city of Richmond and the Norfolk Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been well placed. The con-

struction of this project is on cost and is ahead of schedule.

Also included in this year's bill is the funds necessary to begin the planning and construction of a 3 year, \$15 million Richmond filtration plant flood protection project. Originally authorized as part of the ongoing Richmond floodwall project, the filtration project was deferred in 1978. The Subcommittee on Energy and Water, under the able leadership of its Chairman, TOM BEVILL, has seen the folly of protecting the city's real estate while not protecting the people's drinking water by appropriating the seed money to get this important project planned.

I want to express my appreciation again to the chairman, Mr. BEVILL; to the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PURSELL; and to my good friend Mr. THOMAS of Georgia for their particular attention to these projects.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I find it amazing that we would fund such an expensive project when we have not even gone through the authorization process. I have been listening to this debate, and find it helpful. I know Members want to do the right thing. But I find it amazing that all we have to do is add the word "science," and somehow we think it is a project worth funding.

Mr. Chairman, obviously there are some good science projects, and some that are not so good. I consider the superconducting super collider in the latter area.

The United States is a science creating machine without parallel. No one does scientific research better than the United States. But a country like Japan is a science consuming machine without parallel. They take what we learn and put it to practical use.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Slattery amendment. I oppose the construction of the superconducting super collider because, in my judgment, the SSC is a colossal public works project, not a science research project. We will pass the bill and spend billions of dollars while other nations will take what we learn and put it to practical application.

At one time we were looking for less than \$4 billion to build the SSC. Now we are saying it is going to cost \$5.8 billion. Last year this House, by a vote of 309 to 106, I believe, said we should cap it at \$5 billion. This year, a group of us went to the Committee on Rules and requested that it allow us to offer an amendment to again cap it in this appropriations bill. But the Committee on Rules, in its wisdom, decided not to allow this amendment. Why?

The fact is, this project is going to cost far more than \$5 billion. Because of the budget agreement last fall we are locked into spending caps for the next 4 years.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I look at opportunity costs. I know

we are going to take from needed projects and we are going to put it down a hole, the big hole called the superconducting super collider.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to act responsibly by denying funding for this colossal project. It is a public works project, not a science project. It will cost billions of dollars more than we have appropriated, and the end result is it is going to take from science programs that are truly needed.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and thank him for his excellent statement. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to respond to a very poignant story told earlier by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]. The significant point that has to be emphasized is that that cancer research the gentleman told about was done at Fermi Lab, which is in jeopardy as a result of moving forward with the SSC.

Scientists do not need the energy levels of the SSC to get hydrogen protons. They need those levels only to find smaller atomic particles and to understand the nature of matter. It is misleading in the extreme to sell this as a medical tool. You would be better off giving those dollars to individual researchers at the National Institutes of Health. We know that the approval rate for applications has gone from 60 percent to 25 percent.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, of course, in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY]. To hold back funding at this very critical stage of the SSC would I think only serve to delay the project, and in doing so, increase the initial cost that everyone objects to.

I think in fairness to the DOE and others who are negotiating for us with foreign nations, these debates, though they spawn healthy expressions and some television exposure for many Members, in fairness to the DOE, they do violence and damage to this country's efforts to get aid or any financial assistance from other nations.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss also if I did not thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the new chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, not a Texan, one who vied for the spot, who spoke in favor.

I think it is also significant that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], the immediate past chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, spoke in favor.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that this Congress has spoken

in favor of this project. I think it is high time that we do go forward.

Mr. Chairman, Leon Lederman's name was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and I would be proud to quote Leon Lederman, and will quote him here. He has made an expression in the last 30 days when he testified before the Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources. He is a former director of the Fermilab, and a Nobel Prize winning physicist. I will just read part of what he said.

In the period of 1983 to 1989, while director of the Fermi Lab, I was a prominent advocate of the super collider even after the site decision which located the facility in Waxahatchee, TX, instead of my own State of Illinois.

That is in the very first paragraph.

In the last paragraph he says,

In spite of all the stresses on the federal budget, the long-term investments in research and in education are crucial to the well-being of the Nation. And in any rational program which permits science a reasonable growth, the SSC should be an important factor.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the entire statement by Dr. Lederman.

TESTIMONY OF DR. LEON M. LEDERMAN

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to testify before this committee again. The issue is the Supercollider. I have a long history of association with this concept. I may have been the first to initiate the discussions in 1982 which eventually lead the particle physics community to endorse the SSC as its first priority. In the period of 1983 to 1989, while Director of the Fermi Lab, I was a prominent advocate of the Supercollider even after the site decision which located the facility in Waxahatchee, Texas, instead of in my own state of Illinois.

Since then, I have been a member of the Laboratory Science Policy Committee and of the URA Board of Trustees.

In my comments, I would like to stress four points which are relevant to today's hearing.

These are: (1) the scientific drive for the SSC, (2) alternatives to the SSC, (3) the present cost estimates, schedule and technical difficulties, (4) the question of foreign participation, (5) the importance of the SSC in the context of the health of scientific research in the U.S., including the contentious issue of big science vs small science.

I. THE SCIENTIFIC MOTIVATION FOR THE SSC, REVISITED IN 1991

Discussions of a next step beyond Fermi Lab's Tevatron have been going on since 1978. These achieved a renewed fervor since 1982, stimulated by the CERN success with colliding beams of protons and antiprotons and Fermi Lab's successful mastery of superconducting magnet technology. These encouragements fortified the scientific drive for exploring a new energy frontier, twenty times higher than Fermi Lab, which is the world leader today.

In my forty years of experience, I have witnessed the birth of some four generations of new frontiers in the energy domain. Some have been strongly motivated by scientific puzzles which demanded more incisive measurements at higher energies and some had more diffuse motivations on the general thesis that higher energy usually leads to new

discoveries and new insights. When President Eisenhower (of Columbia University) cut the ribbon on the 400 million volt Nevis Cyclotron, initiating the highest energy particle accelerator of 1950, he opened the door to a new domain of subnuclear research involving the properties of mesons, strong nuclear forces and the entire field of broken symmetries which have continued to prevent us from realizing the complete and, hopefully, beautiful overarching theory of how the physical universe works. (As an input to my later remarks I will point out that in this period there were about 20 particle accelerators on college campuses around the nation.)

The next generation in the billion volt range taught us about antimatter and about a complex and astonishing zoo of new particles produced in the nuclear collisions. So many were found that we were in danger of depleting the greek alphabet, our usual source of names for new particles. In this period there was a world wide entry into the field with machines in unheard of villages near Tokyo, Moscow, Geneva, Hamburg, New York and San Francisco. In the next phase, tens of billions of volts, we began to see what we now believe are the primordial building blocks of the Universe, the quarks and leptons. New accelerator technologies and new detector technologies helped to advance our understanding of matter and the forces that control the coalescence of particles to that which we can see and touch. The present generation of machines, exploring the TeV domain have revealed the full shopping list of ingredients which make a universe.

We believe we have the entire lepton picture and the quark set is missing only one of its six members, the top quark. There is a fair expectation that the top quark will be found at Fermi Lab within the next two to five years. We have now seen all the force-carrying particles, the W's, Z's, gluons and photons. We have learned how to unify and we have succeeded in unifying the weak and electromagnetic forces. Our appetites for unification and simplification have been thoroughly whetted. In an exciting new development, data from the astronomical studies of the birth of the universe (a cosmic accelerator with an unconstrained budget!) have made use of the emerging picture of particles and forces and have in turn contributed early universe data to the so-called standard model of particle physics.

It turns out that collisions in particle accelerators like the SSC are an infinitesimal replica of the normal behavior of all matter shortly after creation of the universe in the Big Bang. It should be encouraging to the Congress that, whereas the SSC may not be the very last accelerator ever wished for by scientists, it does help to close a gap in our ability to study the microworld, the gap between terrestrial machines and the Great-Accelerator-in-the-Sky.

As early as the late 70's it became clear that the Tevatron Generation (including the LEP machine at CERN, the SLC machine at Stanford, the DESY collider in Hamburg and the UNK machine in Serpukhov) would be exceedingly unlikely to address the one enigma that confronted all our efforts. Our aspirations are for a Grand Unified Theory which would account for the six quarks and six leptons and would explain how and why we appear to have four forces. Our efforts to unify and to synthesize the deeper order which must be there is teased and frustrated by our ignorance of new phenomena that must take place at the next energy frontier—the tens of TeV frontier. In fact, the

parameters of the SSC are established by a particular prediction, the possible existence of a mysterious "Higgs" phenomenon. Our theories tell us that something new must happen if we can observe with precision in the domain which SSC is designed to illuminate. In the simplest scenario, we will discover the Higgs Boson (which the Mayor of Waxahatchee, Texas, has assured us we must do as a leader of nations). Higgs bosons seem to be nature's way of hiding the beauty and simplicity of its laws. Higgs fields give a variety of masses to the quarks, leptons and force carrying W's and Z's. SSC is designed to confront the Higgs theory. In more general scenarios, we will uncover the data we need to unify the forces, we will have created the scientific tool to probe more deeply into the inner space, equivalent to observing the rim of the universe in outer space. In fact, both sciences, particle physics and cosmology are essentially dependent on instruments like the SSC and the hopefully soon to be repaired Space Telescope.

By the time SSC comes on the air, the youngest of our accelerator inventory will be over 12 or 15 years old. The interval between gleam-in-the-eye and beam-in-the-Lab will have been about 20 years. In the past decade of SSC activity the motivation for exploring this domain has only become stronger. As data from CERN's LEP machine and the TEVATRON come in, the possibilities for discovery in the SSC domain only become more dramatic. I neglected to mention that Congress played a vital role in this brief history—the famed Joint Committee on Atomic Energy questioned, argued, but inevitably supported this adventure which has brought us so close to a complete synthesis. Although science has made enormous strides in all fields from Anthropology to Zoology, it would have been unthinkable not to have pursued this quest for a comprehension of the world in which we find ourselves. And since this is a Senate Committee and you are beholden to your constituents, let me assure you that this quest has pretty much paid for itself. In story after story we can tell of how the study of quarks has generated invention and technology, has generated economic activity and enhanced the well-being of our citizens. We do not propose the SSC because of its societal benefits but if it fails to deliver on this, it will be the first time in history. I have, Mr. Chairman, deleted the many attributes of SSC that are outside of the scientific drive since these have been stated here many times.

II. ALTERNATIVES FOR THE SSC

The drive to explore the "SSC-domain" is of course shared by physicists the world over. Our colleagues at CERN, the European consortium have proposed to build a "17 TeV" proton-proton collider, using the existing LEP tunnel of 17 mile circumference (LHC). It has been argued that the U.S. could save a huge sum by collaborating with CERN. As best as we can tell the cost of the two machines, when proper accounting is done, is pretty much in the ratio of the energies. The tunnel savings are more than used up in the higher field magnet technology they must master in order to partially overcome the constraints of the tunnel. My real problem with the CERN approach is that it will still require a huge investment in man-years of creative scientists and engineers as well as resources but with a much reduced guarantee of confronting the crucial scientific issues that motivate both machines.

A careful reexamination of the energy parameters by HEPAP a year ago lead to the conclusion that:

"... any substantial reduction in the energy of the SSC would compromise our ability to elucidate the nature of electroweak symmetry (i.e. Higgs) a truly fundamental problem at the core of the Standard Model."

Since the SSC will be the U.S. machine through the first decades of the 21st century, a constrained collaboration with the Europeans on a much weaker proposal would seem not to serve the needs of science or of the U.S. particle physics community.

III. COST ESTIMATES TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

Here I can only offer a visceral reaction to the present cost estimate. I believe there is ample contingency in the estimate to cover a host of as yet unforeseen difficulties. This is not a simple machine and the basic culture of machine designers is to devise improvements which will enhance the reliability and performance characteristics. The one concern I have has to do with the performance of industry in the fabrication of superconducting magnets. I believe we have a workable magnet design. There is now a solid core of experience at the collaborating national laboratories in the assembly of these very intricate devices. This knowledge will be transferred to industry at Fermi Lab and Brookhaven in a plan that seems to have anticipated most contingencies. Still, the record of U.S. industry in carrying out advance technological manufacture on budget and schedule is not great. I suspect this will require continuous vigilance.

I would like to stress that the cost increases have been greatly exaggerated in the press. The estimated cost of the accelerator has indeed been increased by about 30-40 percent since the early CDG estimates in 1984. However, the numbers now used are responsive to the Congressional insistence that it know the total project cost. This includes inflation, contingency (almost \$1 billion), experimental equipment and pre-operating costs. Thus the current estimate of \$8.3 billion should not be compared with earlier estimates of \$4 billion which applied to the machine alone.

To summarize, I believe that able management can result in a machine which meets the specifications and which can be built in nine or ten years within the budget requested. It is by no means an easy machine and it will require very close monitoring by DOE, by the URA contractors and by the scientific community (HEPAP) to insure that this able management is in place and functioning well.

IV. INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

Here I confess to some mystification as to why progress has been so slow. I personally know of intense discussions at the scientist-to-scientist level with colleagues in Japan, Korea, Brazil, India, Italy, Taiwan, Canada, Soviet Union, Mexico. I was instrumental in obtaining a pledge from then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi through his Science Advisor for a \$50M contribution of in-kind components for the accelerator. Such a contribution would reduce the costs of US taxpayers by 4 or 5 times that much because of low labor costs in India. Indian engineers are now in residence at SSCL so that it isn't a lost cause.

Enthusiasm for participation and recognition of mutual benefits have come from scientists and science policy officials in all the countries I mentioned. Why we haven't signed these up yet is an enigma unless it is due to the mixed signals that DOE gets from the Congress. In so far as detectors are concerned, the detectors that SSCL is encouraging have strong collaborations from Japan,

Soviet Union, UK, France, Italy, Israel, Beijing, Bulgaria, Canada, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. (Of course if I'm counting, it is not clear how we count the Soviet Union.)

My point is clear. LHC will clearly cut into the support which Europe will give to the machine construction. However, given a vigorous drive by high enough officials, I still believe that we can tie down substantial foreign contributions. Of course, there is a kind of price. The foreign nations in general want to share in the technology development by contributing interesting components. These will then not be made in the U.S.

V. THE IMPACT ON OTHER SCIENCES: BIG VS. SMALL

Mr. Chairman, during the years 1984-1989, when I was "on the road" selling SSC to anyone who would listen, I had a disclaimer: "Of course, SSC must be constructed with new appropriations. It would not be acceptable if SSC funds came out of a fixed science budget." This point was accepted by Presidents Reagan and Bush and reiterated by two Secretaries of Energy. Since that time, I have been made keenly aware of the strains in the academic science community, strains which surely exist in spite of very substantial increases in the Federal funding of science.

These strains naturally tend to make the individual investigator sensitive to what he or she would perceive as a diversion of funding to large facilities. This thereby exacerbates the conflict between those scientists that require centrally shared, expensive facilities and the traditional professors who, with a few postdocs and graduate students, do their work on campus.

It seems clear to me that the nation must find a reasonable balance between such shared facilities as telescopes, space observatories, oceanographic vessels, genome biologists, synchrotron light source materials scientists and those individual investigators who are fortunate and clever enough to do their research on a table top in the University. It is also clear to me that in general the nation is, in 1991, underinvesting in science, a statement that echoes such distinguished people as Erich Bloch, Allen Bromley, Frank Press, Congressman George Brown and Senator Al Gore, just to name a few. There are other balances that must be managed here: that between basic research and applied research, that between university research and national laboratory research and it is probably important that the health of industrial research is also of concern to the Congress. In spite of all the stresses on the Federal budget, the long term investments in research and in education are crucial to the well-being of the nation. And in any rational program which permits science a reasonable growth, the SSC should be an important factor.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that the person being quoted, Dr. Lederman, for whom we have great respect, testified before the Senate in April that it is likely if we proceed with the SSC, we are going to have to close two other labs to make room for the funding, which means that Fermi Lab might go, or Stanford, or Brookhaven, and that is a cause of great concern.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, to the mention of

shutting down two or three existing labs, I have submitted the entire speech of Dr. Lederman here. I just quoted the beginning and the ending, so Members can see his lead-in and how his finale was. Read the entire speech, and the gentleman will find he does not say what the gentleman is saying he is saying.

Mr. BOEHLERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I am like that famous newscaster who wants to tell the rest of the story.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me finish with the rest of the story, and I will go further. There is talk of risk. Of course, there is risk. There is risk in any worthwhile undertaking.

They have argued that there are technical risks associated with the development of the superconducting magnet. I would only ask Members to remember a similar situation as we listened to the beep-beep of the sputnik, before some of you were born. I might ask there, would they have told President Kennedy, do not go ahead with that, because there is risk, it is dangerous? It is going to be expensive?

□ 1650

Would those same people tell medical researchers today that the risks are too high, it is too expensive to look for that cure for cancer, perhaps in space?

I would suggest to Members that it is a lot of money. I also suggest that it is very important that this country regain its position as a leader in the world of technology, a position that we had in the late 1940's and early 1950's when we had a position of financial strength, respect in the eyes of the world, we were strong geopolitically, and that is what we are reaching for. It will be expensive. It has been expensive and it will be expensive.

I would only hope and suggest that we urge our colleagues, and that each of us talk to our colleagues to keep the faith, to continue the vote that they have cast heretofore on this. Perhaps some of them are opposed because their State or their site was not selected. I understand that. I did not really like it when they did not select a site in my district. I am parochial about my district. I expect other Members to be parochial about their districts.

But I ask you as Members of this Congress and as Americans who care about the future of this country, be parochial about your Nation and let us build this facility, and build it as this Congress wants us to build it.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to nearly eliminate a funding for the supercollider project.

Like everyone, I am all in favor of education, and good science makes for good education. But I am also all in favor of cutting the deficit, because if

we don't, education—along with everything else in this country—will suffer.

This amendment would reduce the deficit. By stopping a project, the costs of which are rising with each new estimate, it would let the American people know we are ready, willing, and able to cut well-intentioned but less-than-essential spending. It will show them we can put the national financial interest above local or regional special interests.

Speaking of which, I saw in this week's C.Q. that one of our colleagues described the SSC as "one of the hungriest hogs at the Federal trough." This hog is too hungry for me.

You know what happens when a hog crosses the hog line: It is slaughtered.

Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. Chairman, today we are asking Congress to do something that we do not do a very good job of, and that is make an investment in the future. We are pretty good at spending; not very good at investing.

The SSC must remain a national priority if we are to maintain our economic competitiveness and leadership position in basic science and technology. Building the SSC will offer important benefits to the American people and there are applications of the technology related to the SSC that are already impacting many areas of science, both big and small in universities and laboratories throughout the country. Benefits are accruing in many fields of computers, materials, sciences, medical treatment and equipment, and other high-technology areas important to the future of this country.

Critics have raised questions about the costs and scheduling of the SSC.

The message that the SSC is on time and on budget is a message that needs to be delivered over and over.

Under the leadership of the Secretary of Energy, we have a strong management team in place, a team that has successfully built technologically comparable projects and possesses world renowned technological capabilities.

The supercollider site in Ellis County, TX, has proven to be an excellent choice. A sound and comprehensive geotechnical program is in place.

The superconducting magnet program which has been criticized today is, contrary to criticism, moving forward in a measured and thoughtful manner. This program is carefully structured to effect the transfer of the magnet technology from the laboratory to industry.

The State of Texas has put its money where its mouth is—to the tune of

nearly \$100 million in land and \$1 billion in other contributions. We must send a strong message to our partners in the project that the Congress is committed to and will continue to support and fund the project.

The SSC is a living, growing laboratory that has already brought us advances in cancer treatment and plastics technology. The SSC is expected to bring this country advances in not only cancer and other medical research, but in electronics, transportation, fiberoptics, data processing, and energy.

High-energy physics in this country has been instrumental in the last 60 years in advancing technology in this country and improving the quality of life. Because of high-energy physics, this country has made critical advancements in the treatment of cancer and other medical disorders, the invention of the television, the development of computers, and important advances in railways, shipbuilding, and automobile design and propulsion. High-energy physics has led to one success story after another.

The SSC is an integral element in this Nation's commitment to educational, scientific, and technological leadership in the next century. Our country cannot afford to do without it.

This project is on time and is under budget. There has been no indication otherwise. The SSC is the most reviewed and researched science project in the history of this country. It has come through its scrutiny with flying colors.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment so that we can move forward to investing in the future of America. Vote no and invest in our children's future.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a brief statement in opposition to the amendment.

Let me remind my colleagues what the SSC is all about. It is about future economic growth and technological leadership gained from advances in science and engineering. Those advocating SSC cuts tend to forget just how important the SSC will be to our Nation in terms of its potential scientific and engineering contributions.

The SSC will be one of the Nation's best scientific and engineering training grounds. A project the size and complexity of the SSC involves an incredible number of engineers, computer scientists, technicians, and physicists to complete. Only a central facility like the SSC can provide universities, scientists, and engineers an opportunity to advance many fields of research and technology at the same time.

Make no mistake about it. It is fundamental research like that contemplated with the SSC that makes technological advances possible. These

advances and breakthroughs in science and technology are crucial to our future economic growth and standard of living. As a Nation, we would be foolish to turn our backs on the opportunity represented by the SSC to strengthen our future economic prospects.

We cannot accept today's proposals to, in effect, terminate the SSC. I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for the future—against this amendment and for the SSC.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make an observation. I have been watching intently the debate in the last half hour or so. We have had opponents of the SSC from Michigan, from Illinois, from New York, from Florida, from Pennsylvania, and from Ohio, and we have heard from the proponents of the SSC from Texas, and Texas, and Texas, and Texas. I understand that. Quite frankly, if I were from Texas, I would probably be in the well with the gentleman.

But the fact of the matter is I cannot stand idly by and have this project claim to be one of the best, most important, all-encompassing projects in the history of man, when the very people who are asked to evaluate the project, the Industrial Research Institute, the private sector corporate VP's rated this at the bottom of the list of projects, big science megabucks projects that offer the most promise for the future of America. That is what I fail to understand, why the gentlemen can claim other than through parochial ties that this is such an exciting endeavor.

Mr. FROST. I will be glad to respond to my friend from New York. I guess I have the disadvantage of historical memory.

I have been in the House for 13 years now, and I do recall the early days when this project was contemplated, and I do recall the support at that time of Members from Ohio, and Michigan, and Illinois, and California, and Tennessee, and the various States that were under consideration for this project. And I do recall their very enthusiastic support, and their regular meeting, as indicated by my colleague on your side of the aisle from Texas earlier in this debate. So this project, in fact, had great support at the time that all of the other States were under consideration.

□ 1700

This project has continued to have great support as indicated by the overwhelming votes year after year in favor of this project.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleague that I was a supporter of the SSC on May 2, 1990, when this House voted 309 to 106 to authorize the project.

Incidentally, the Senate never followed through, so this project has never, this whole endeavor, been authorized.

My diminished enthusiasm for the project is not because New York did not get it. I mean, I supported it after New York was out of the competition, but my diminished enthusiasm for this project is because of the escalating costs, the total lack of foreign participation, and just the lukewarm reception we are getting in the international community for the endeavor.

Mr. FROST. Further responding to the gentleman, I think Texans are an enthusiastic lot, as indicated by the fact that Texas has already put up most of the money that we pledged for the project. We are proud of the project, and all of us are pleased to be able to stand in support of it.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to close the debate on behalf of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and myself in support of our amendment.

One of my colleagues said just a moment ago that Congress spoke in favor of the SSC, just last year. My colleague from New York mentioned his support just a year ago in May.

Let us make it very clear what the Congress supported just about a year ago. We supported a spending cap of \$5 billion by the Federal Government. That now has grown to somewhere between \$6 billion and \$8 billion. We supported a 20-percent participation by foreign governments. That has not even yielded 1 percent of the total cost. We supported creating technical milestones so that when this project is constructed, it will be constructed under the terms of appropriate engineering and science. We supported total cost assumptions which has gone past \$2 billion.

We appropriated and requested that the appropriations be contingent on Texas paying \$1 billion, plus land. They have paid \$875 million, and hopefully will pay the balance, I have every reason to believe.

But the fact of the matter is, that like the lady entertainer on "Saturday Night Live," we are now facing the unenviable situation of having read the news, and she now says, "Never mind."

The fact of the matter is, that this House did speak in support of the superconducting super collider 1 year ago, and we did it, placing meaningful restraints—scientific, technological, engineering, and fiscal. Every single one of those constraints has been rejected.

This committee was not allowed to consider placing those restraints of support upon this appropriation and fined the nature of this bill.

What are we now asked to do here? We are asked to simultaneously research, test, design, and build the single biggest, complicated scientific project in the history of this Nation, making no comparisons with the space program at all.

We proceeded one step at a time, each of us will remember, culminating with that final great leap to the Moon when it was all done. We have had much experience with researching, testing, building, and designing all at the same time, and most of that experience rests with the Pentagon, and we know what has happened with many of those weapons systems.

We know that much of the medicine that has been talked about, the advances that have come have come from the lab of the gentleman from Illinois, which came dangerously close to closing. We have heard the proponents tell us that the superconducting super collider will cure everything except the heartbreak of psoriasis. The fact of the matter is, that the superconducting super collider will not make one person well in this country.

Mapping the human gene will; creating diamond films or conductivity of polymers, artificial intelligence, biotechnology—will make people well.

Near-term benefits and near-term costs, that is what this is all about. The fact of the matter is, that we are great at investing in this country. What we are bad at is paying, and the superconducting super collider will not pay this Nation anywhere near before it is obsolete, because the fact of the matter is, that the research that will come from this within 10 years, will no longer be of scientific value.

If you don't take my word for it, 3,500 scientists were recently polled by Gallup, and an assessment of what it is they thought this Nation should invest in, in terms of science and research for this country, and less than 3 percent of them, thought the expenditures for the superconducting super collider were worth anything at all.

Oversight, that is what the Congress is supposed to do, and that is what we are charged with. The GAO told us most eloquently, "Do not build it until you test the magnets. Do not let the tunnel construction go forward until the engineering is verified. Do not compress the time schedule. The Pentagon learned that lesson." And yet, the magnets remain a significant risk for the successful development of the SSC.

Yes, many of us have changed our positions on this matter. The Slattery-Eckart-Boehlert-Wolpe-Shays amendment reflects the change, because the fact of the matter is, that when the Congress of the United States first embarked upon acceptance of this project,

the budget was supposed to be balanced in the year 1991, and if you do not believe me, just ask Ronald Reagan if that was not his plan.

But the fact of the matter is, that the best laid plans of all of us, often get thrown askew in the course of real life. The simple fact of the matter is, once again, that big science is going to step on small science in a real big way.

Everyone has commended the committee and the difficult circumstances they find themselves in, and I do not think that the sponsors of this amendment delude themselves in any way that we believe we are going to prevail.

But if we do not make this fight, if we do not ask the questions, if we do not drive home the point that it will be virtually impossible for this Nation to compete without the ability to pay for what it is that we want to compete with, we will be bankrupt—both economically and scientifically.

Indeed, George Bush was right, when he stood out on the steps of this Capitol just a few short years ago and spoke with these words, "This Nation has more will than we have wallet."

The fact of the matter is, that the superconducting super collider will crowd out everything else from our wallet. We are asked to buy before we fly. We are told it is, indeed, a blank check, but there is only one problem: This Government's signature is already on the bottom of that check.

I ask my colleagues to join my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and others, in support of this amendment and make it very clear for those of us who believe that the true future of America's growth lies in improving the quality of life, which we can gain from significant improvement in real science that affects real people's lives. Not a handful of physicists operating in a deep, dark tunnel in one small part of this country.

We will vote to end the superconducting super collider and return real science to real people.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a Member from Ohio, and I could recall the process whereby everybody was bidding. Each State was bidding to attract the super collider.

The State of Ohio was willing to put up a ton of money to attract the project to our State. Our State officials told me, as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, it would be the greatest technology improvement the State of Ohio could ever have such a major part in if we were to land it. One of our sites was one of the final sites.

If Ohio had been fortunate enough to be chosen, Members from Ohio would be on the floor today fighting for the

superconducting super collider. Members from Michigan would be fighting for the project if it were a Michigan site that was picked. Members from Kentucky would be fighting for it; Kansas would be fighting for it.

There is more political gas today colliding than any item that would collide in the great project.

Ohio did not get it. I wish we did. Things are bad.

But a State in America got it: Texas. We have had tremendous advantages from America's pursuit of the space program. The trickle down to everything else has helped every State in the Union.

So now we have come to a decision, and the winner was Texas. So what do we have here today? Now all of a sudden it is about money. Now it is about unworthiness. Today it is about political hypocrisy, because if you would have gotten the project, you would not be opening up your mouth.

I stand today for America, and I am going to tell you something, this money, like everything else, will end up overseas. It is not going to Mexico. It is not going to Korea. It is going to Texas. It is going to America. It will help America become competitive.

It was good enough through the process when we were all bidding for it and Illinois was opening up the bank for this project using every political tool and method they had, just like everybody else was. I do not know how Members are going to vote on this thing, but today, as a Member of Congress, after our country has, through a formal process, made a decision and has selected Texas, I am here today supporting the super collider, supporting America's technology gains in the future and, damn it, I am supporting Texas.

□ 1710

I would like every Member in the Congress to remember this. If this project was scheduled for your State or your district, those Members would be standing here today fighting and extolling its virtues. If the project was good enough when we bid on it, the project is damned good enough when we provided some funds for it.

I urge the Members to reject the amendment, to support the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and all the chairmen and leaders who have, in fact, discussed this project from day one through its process of coming up with the money.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, as he so often does, has put his finger right on a very important point. The majority of Members of Congress that are involved with the superconducting super collider because

they got calls from the Governor or the industrial development commissioner back home and said that this is a significant public works jobs program.

I have been a consistent supporter of public works jobs programs, but now we are talking about how we are prioritizing a limited science budget, and I would suggest to my colleague in the well that this does not get a high enough priority to warrant its inclusion in the budget, when we have NIH, the National Institutes of Health, researchers with worthy projects, going begging for dollars, when we do not have enough money for science and math education, to make the United States as competitive as we want to be in the future. It is a matter of priority.

I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is a matter of priority when we are talking about the super collider. I do not hear the same arguments when we are talking about \$160 billion for NATO, about \$20 some billion in foreign aid.

Let me submit to the Members of Congress, I do not know what the stand is of the National Institutes of Health. They are not getting enough money, then they are not doing a damn good enough job in the Congress because everybody is getting a hell of a lot of money who should not. I am talking about the project itself. It is good for our country, our country will grow, and ladies and gentleman, let me say one thing.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAFICANT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. If America is going to be able to compete with nations that could hire people for 17 cents an hour, America is going to have to do it better. America is going to have to be smarter. America is going to have to protect our patents, our discoveries, and a greater ability through our technology to prevail, just like we did in Desert Storm.

If we are going to do that, we are going to have to make an investment, and the investment is not in Ohio. That really does frost me. I am saying to the Members of Congress that when Ohio drives up with a worthwhile project, we expect Members to pay attention to us.

However, if this project was worthwhile when the Members from Kansas were bidding on it, and your Governors were extolling its virtues, and Members were trying to highlight it and get their testimony on the RECORD, if it was good enough for the Governor from Ohio to call me, and the only time he ever called me is when he had a damn political problem. If it was good enough for the Governor, then it was good enough for the Governors of Kansas, Illinois, and Michigan, it is good enough for Texas. It is good for our

country, and I ask the Members to vote for it, even though the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] makes such a strong, strong, argument.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Always.

Mr. BOEHLERT. My colleague is aware of the international dimensions for this project, and the whole funding mechanism?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, I am more concerned today with America rather than international problems.

Once again, I think the domestic ramifications for America's high-technology future depend on this type of bold initiative. It will cost some money, folks, and the money will be spent in Texas. Thank God it is not overseas.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly take the floor now to speak against the amendment. I think enough has been said, probably more than enough, of what most people want to learn about the SSC. This is the most expensive research equipment this country has ever purchased. It certainly is the largest, most sophisticated, most expensive particle accelerator any nation has ever built.

There have been statements made that President Bush and/or DOE has not been honest with Congress. That they have been trying to get their foot in the door by giving estimates that were not proper, and knowing they were not proper. However, our committee does not find that to be the fact, unless a Member has some evidence that we did not have. There have been some changes that have happened since the early estimates were made on a conceptual design. The \$5.3 billion was a conceptual design that was developed from a concept more than 5 years ago.

Since that time, we now have a definite site. We have a design now which has been nailed down, contrary again to what people are saying. The design is final. There will probably be some fine tuning and engineering in the final design, but the changes have already been made.

As an example, the aperture that Members see on this table, that is the tube, the size of the beam that will circulate around the circumference has been increased from 4 centimeters to 5 centimeters to make the machine more efficient, to do better work. The circumference, the distance around the tunnel, has been increased from 52 miles originally, to 54. The fact that we have had inflation since that period of time, all of these have added to the additional expense.

In addition, there is a 20-percent contingency cost to the machine, nearly \$1

billion, which has helped drive up the cost.

However, we were fully apprised as a committee as these changes were being made and suggested. We have gone along with them.

The energy level, the amount of kick, the boost that will push that particle around 250,000 times a second around the tube and crash into each other has doubled in power, from 1 trillion electronic volts to 2 trillion electronic volts. All of these have cost more money, a lot more.

Now, there has been criticism about what this machine may or may not do. I do not think, really, that anyone knows for sure the capability of this machine. We have built lots of accelerators. We have them in many universities, as has been suggested today.

Look at some of the accomplishments that high-energy physics has given everyone. The supercomputers, the chips that we have been able to develop. The biotechnology. What a wide-open area we have here. It has been suggested here today about some of the accomplishments in biotech.

In the medical diagnostic work, the PET scan and the CAT scan as an example, the magnetic resonance imagery now able to examine bodies and parts of our bodies, and tell without surgery what is inside, what the problem may be. All of these have been developed because of the science that we have developed. The laser has been developed because of this. With laser surgery, we do not need to use a knife in surgery. Inoperative cancer now can be treated either by laser or by the proton beam and other accelerator beams. Cancers that would have been fatal now can be treated because we have had research.

Now, it has also been suggested because of this huge expenditure, we will probably have to cut some medical research. I do not know what medical research we are going to cut. We may not expand some of them, but the mere fact that we have the medical research, most of it came from the fact that we have done research in the past, we have built smaller machines in the past, to do this type of work.

It has been criticized that we do not know how to build the magnets. The fact is that we now have built and tested a 40-millimeter magnet. Now the magnets that will be used in this machine will be 50 millimeters. These are presently being designed. They have not been built yet, but the machines have been built at Fermi and Brookhaven and are 40 centimeters. We will increase them, the ring around them that holds the beam in 10 centimeters. We do know how to do it and it has been successfully tested. The fact is true that we have not built the 50 millimeter at this time.

Now, the criticism of the foreign involvement. Just a few weeks ago,

President Bush met with the Prime Minister of Japan, and I have been told that in that discussion about Japan's involvement with the superconducting super collider, the question came up from the Prime Minister, "Is the United States going to build it?"

□ 1720

Do you think the rest of the world is not watching this debate? Would there be any reason that you would doubt whether the United States is firm in its commitment after hearing this debate today? Would you want to stick a lot of money, or even make a commitment until we know for sure the United States is going to do it?

I am surprised that as many nations have expressed interest as they have.

Yes, India has pledged \$50 million. Yes, we have some scientists here that we are paying some money for their work in this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MYERS of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking this additional minute, but we are paying these people, some foreigners, and particularly the Indians, some living expenses, but this is all through the area of research.

We have some scientists living in other countries that those countries pay them; but yes, other countries will make a commitment. We do not have the absolute dollars from every country, but I do not blame them. I would not want to do it, either.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in closing, it has been suggested that now is the time when we all know how tough times are now, we do not have a lot of money; but I have often made the statement that as a nation if we only had \$1 million to invest someplace, do you know of anyplace that would be better to invest that \$1 million if that is all the United States had to invest than in research for the future, to be competitive with the rest of the world to solve the serious problems of health and the advancing of technology to make American industry more competitive? Is there any better place?

If I may use a personal experience, my family used to be in the theater business. One day television came in. Times were tough. Dad said, "We'll cut out advertising. We'll buy cheaper film." The rest of the family prevailed and we increased our advertising and bought better film to be competitive.

This is true today. This would not be the place to make the cut.

Again in closing, this piece of equipment, this superconducting super collider is the type of research, the high-energy physics that cannot be done at any 1 of the 100 or all the 100

so-called colliders at universities. It is a different type of research on a different level entirely. It cannot be done at Fermi or anyplace else. This is research that can only be done by this super collider. It is going to cost a lot of money, but I think it is an investment in our future that we cannot afford to pass up today.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a long discussion and I think a very good discussion. I think some good points have been brought out. This project has been one of the points that has concerned many because it is an expensive project. No one can deny that; but I might also point out, that in the international scientific world, it has created more excitement than any project that we have had before.

As you know, this is not a new project. This is something we have been funding and working on. We have been working on the magnets, for example, for 7 years. As you hear, they have been perfected. They are moving along. The magnets go beyond any expectations.

We talk about the cost. We come up with all these figures. Yes, the figures bounce back and forth and we all are frustrated for awhile. But back in the spring the U.S. Department of Energy made it clear that this was the total cost estimate and I think it is the best figure that we could possibly humanly get. Four panels of scientists made a review, separate reviews, the Superconducting Super Collider Laboratory, the Energy Review Committee, the High Energy Physics Review Panel, and the Independent Cost Estimate Panel.

Although it has not been mentioned, actually they presented some four different figures, each one of the panels presenting a different figure. The only thing we have heard so far today with all this talk going on here for hours, is that it is going to cost some \$11 billion. Really only one panel estimated a higher cost than the estimate of \$8.25 billion. The other three all hit right around that figure.

So let us get this clear once and for all about the cost estimates. These are estimates that the scientists made and they were made after many, many weeks and months of study and debate, determining exactly how much it was going to cost and considering all the changes that have been made. So that is where we are, with the \$8.2 billion figure.

The State of Texas has, of course, committed \$1 billion and they have already put \$149 million of that into this project.

We have spent some \$748 million so far on the superconducting super collider; \$448 million of that \$748 million was operations and \$300 million is

for construction. If there is a question whether or not it was under construction, there is a display over in the Cannon Building and you can see pictures showing that the project has been started for some time.

We get misinformation sometimes, I have noticed.

Secretary Henson Moore of the U.S. Department of Energy, has traveled around the world and he is very optimistic about the countries that are going to participate. But as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has pointed out, these countries are looking at us. They are wanting to be sure that the United States is going along with it.

We have just pulled the rug out from under the space station in which Japan was participating. Now just one more blow, Mr. Chairman, and I think we will have had it as far as our international scientific world is concerned.

You know, actually at the rate we are going over the last few years, just as Chairman BROWN of the Science and Technology Committee pointed out, this country is slipping when it comes to scientific work.

We cannot be assured of just exactly what is going to happen in the future but I can tell you what has happened so far, and this is official. The development of the superconducting super collider components certainly are going to improve the capabilities and the expertise in U.S. industries.

We have 100 universities who are participating in this project here in the United States.

Actually, the superconducting super collider research and development has already yielded improved superconducting wire and the development of radiation resistant plastics, both having significant medical applications.

I am sorry that somebody was misinformed that this is not going to mean anything to medical care, because it has already done that. We are just getting under way. I think this is an exciting project.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEVILL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEVILL. So actually, Mr. Chairman, we have talked all day about the costs. I just want to make a few remarks about that.

The \$8.2 billion is what it is going to cost, counting the research that has been done, up to the time the project is complete.

There was one of the four panels added some other factors that were in error. That is why they did not come close to the other three panels that agreed that \$8.25 billion is the total cost of this project. Certainly with \$1.25 billion from Japan and other

countries such as India, Germany, and Italy and all the other countries that have an interest in this. I might just add in closing that the Fermi lab has over \$200 million in this bill.

Now, the Fermi lab, and I am not talking about my friends and colleagues in the Illinois delegation, I admire every one of them; but I am talking about the Fermi lab. After getting over \$200 million in the bill, they wanted to start a new project. As I mentioned at the beginning, this is a new project that they are talking about. For that reason, we turned them down, but we had turned everybody down on every new project that has been proposed, and so this is where the difference has come in.

This is a good project. The panel that sits there and listens to days and days of testimony from the scientists, some of the best scientists in the world, are unanimous in support of this project.

The Appropriations Committee itself supports the project, the Appropriations Committee as a whole, 55 Members voted something like 3 to 1 in support of the SSC.

We have cut \$100 million out and we say that that is enough and this project ought to proceed. We should be encouraging the bright young people in this Nation to get into science and to work at these labs, but so far in the last few years we have been discouraging them. If we do not turn that around, we are going to be a Third World in the scientific world.

□ 1730

Mr. Chairman, I urge a vote against this amendment and let us pass this bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, last year I voted against the authorization for the superconducting super collider. For that reason I rise in support of the Slatery amendment to terminate the SSC.

Not only can we not afford the SSC in terms of its projected cost, we can not afford the consequences that continuing the SSC will have on research as it relates to physics in general: Both high-energy and solid state physics research.

Recall if you will, Mr. Chairman, the opposition to the SSC project at the outset on the part of the solid state physicists who though favoring the project in principal, pointed out that given the then high cost projections for the SSC, conveyed their concerns that the SSC would adversely affect the funding for solid state research.

Mr. Chairman, we have not only seen that fear become a reality, we have gone beyond the point that the solid state physicists feared and are now confronted with the fact that the SSC is absorbing the funds committed to high energy research at facilities such as Fermi Laboratory.

But, Mr. Chairman, to compound the irony, we are about to virtually shut down high-energy research all together for a period of years in order that all available funds be provided to the SSC.

As I understand the rationale for the SSC, Mr. Chairman, its basic premise is to find the answer to the most elemental question confronting physics: Why does matter have mass? The resolution to this question is premised on finding the elusive particle called the quark, a subnuclear particle.

Interestingly, Mr. Chairman, the rationale for the expansion of the Fermi lab and for the creation of the SSC is the same—the quest for the quark.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus in the scientific community that it is at Fermi that we are most likely to find the quark, sooner and at a fraction of the projected cost of the SSC. As the New York Times science columnist, Malcolm W. Browne, wrote on May 19, 1991.

There is a consensus among physicists that Fermi lab now offers the best prospect for finding the elusive quark, provided that the new upgraded injector is built for the Tevatron accelerator.

The total projected cost of the Fermi III project is \$177.8 million with completion scheduled for 1996. Contrast this with the presently projected cost for the SSC of \$11.8 billion as recently forecast by the General Accounting Office and with a completion date expected in the year 2005.

Mr. Chairman, I can not support the SSC when the consequence is that high-energy physics research will be stopped dead in its tracks until, optimistically, the year 2005 when the SSC is to be operable.

If we are truly concerned with maintaining a position of leadership in high energy physics research we have no alternative but to provide the necessary funds to Fermi and dispense with the unacceptably high cost and risk that the superconducting super collider entails. I support the Slattery amendment.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I oppose funding for the superconducting super collider because I don't believe the country can afford such a questionable project at this time. The superconducting super collider would use superconducting magnets to accelerate atomic particles beams to high speeds and collide them, in order to examine the interactions of subatomic particles in the resulting reaction. I question whether we should be working to solve the mysteries of subatomic particles with this price tag, and neglect the problems faced every day by millions of working American families. I must disagree with spending billions to discover what is holding atoms together, when our full attention should be focused on what we need to do to hold our society together.

I question the SSC in terms of the Nation's scientific priorities. I believe we should focus the Nation's resources more on what is called small science, more practical consumer products. Supporters of the collider will tell you that it will help keep American technology foremost in the world. Our international competitors devote much more of their research to consumer technologies, like high definition television and semiconductors. Shouldn't we, for example, be exploring a more powerful, longer lasting battery that can be used in electric cars, or increased use of ethanol fuels? Our trade deficit is not the result of falling behind in particle accelerator technology.

Some argue that the collider technologies will spin off to produce collateral benefits. But one of the most important and most expensive components of the project, the superconducting magnets which provide the impetus to accelerate the particles, is not taking advantage of the recent advances in superconducting research. That research—an example of small science—has discovered ceramic compounds which act as superconductors at dramatically higher temperatures than the metallic alloys being proposed for the magnets for this collider. Wouldn't it be more constructive, and do more to advance America's standing in the field of superconductivity, to go slower and try to use these revolutionary changes in the super collider?

In fact, the schedule for construction of the collider dipole magnets is already so compressed that development phases overlap. Thus, when problems are encountered in a current phase, the next phase will already be underway, and incorporating changes in design will mean reengineering and wasted time. The current plans for the SSC include beginning construction on the magnets before they can be string tested, which means testing the magnets together with their support components such as the power supply and cooling systems. In 1983, the Department of Energy terminated the Issabelle collider because the superconducting magnets did not work as intended. At the time, about 75 percent of the construction had been completed. We should learn from this mistake. We should not allow ourselves to get 75 percent through this project, which would amount to nearly \$7 billion, and then discover that it won't work as expected.

I am concerned that this project is a pig in a poke. We are apparently once again faced with unknown cost overruns. In 1989, Secretary of Energy James Watkins stated that the SSC would not be built if "it went a penny above \$5.9 billion" in total costs. Today, the Department of Energy is telling us that the cost will be \$9.1 billion, an increase of 50 percent already. That assumes that the string-testing of the dipole magnets is successful. If we have a repeat of the Issabelle mistakes, we will be looking at several billion dollars more to bail out the SSC. We will hear that familiar argument, that we have already committed too much to back out. We should not stand for these ever-escalating numbers, or assume the cost will not continue to rise.

Proponents of the collider argue that it will give us insight into the structure of atomic particles. But I would like to see more attention on the structure of our society. We must devote our energies to making health care available, educating our children, making taxes fair, and making life better for working families. No matter which way you look at it, this is too much money, too soon, for a project of highly questionable merit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 251, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—165

Andrews (ME)	Herger	Reed
Atkins	Hertel	Regula
Bellenson	Hoagland	Ridge
Bennett	Horn	Ritter
Bereuter	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Bilbray	James	Ros-Lehtinen
Billakis	Johnson (CT)	Rostenkowski
Boehert	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Boxer	Johnston	Roukema
Broomfield	Jones (GA)	Russo
Bunning	Jontz	Sabo
Burton	Kanjorski	Sanders
Camp	Klecza	Sangmeister
Campbell (CA)	Kolbe	Santorum
Campbell (CO)	Kostmayer	Sawyer
Clement	LaFalce	Schaefer
Coble	Lancaster	Scheuer
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Leach	Schulze
Conyers	Levin (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
Cox (IL)	Lipinski	Shays
Davis	Long	Shuster
DeFazio	Lowe (NY)	Sikorski
Derrick	Machtley	Sisisky
Dickinson	Markey	Slattery
Dingell	Martin	Slaughter (NY)
Donnelly	McCurdy	Snowe
Dooley	McDermott	Solarz
Dorgan (ND)	Meyers	Solomon
Duncan	Mfume	Spratt
Durbin	Miller (CA)	Stark
Early	Moody	Studds
Eckart	Moorhead	Sundquist
Espy	Moran	Swett
Evans	Morella	Swift
Feighan	Murphy	Synar
Fish	Neal (MA)	Tallon
Flake	Neal (NC)	Thomas (WY)
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Traxler
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Unsoeld
Gedden	Obey	Upton
Gillmor	Owens (NY)	Valentine
Gilman	Pallone	Vander Jagt
Glickman	Parker	Vento
Goodling	Patterson	Visclosky
Gordon	Paxon	Waters
Gradison	Payne (NJ)	Weiss
Grandy	Penny	Weldon
Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)	Williams
Hamilton	Peterson (MN)	Wise
Hancock	Petri	Wolpe
Hayes (IL)	Porter	Wyden
Herfey	Poshard	Zeliff
Henry	Ravenel	Zimmer

NOES—251

Abercrombie	Browder	DeLay
Alexander	Brown	Dellums
Allard	Bruce	Dicks
Anderson	Bryant	Dixon
Andrews (NJ)	Bustamante	Doolittle
Andrews (TX)	Byron	Dorman (CA)
Annunzio	Callahan	Downey
Anthony	Cardin	Dreier
Applegate	Carper	Dwyer
Archer	Carr	Dymally
Armey	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Baker	Clay	Edwards (OK)
Ballenger	Clinger	Edwards (TX)
Barnard	Coleman (MO)	Emerson
Barrett	Coleman (TX)	English
Barton	Combest	Erdreich
Bateman	Condit	Fascell
Bentley	Cooper	Fawell
Berman	Costello	Fazio
Bevill	Cox (CA)	Fields
Billey	Coyne	Foglietta
Boehner	Cramer	Ford (TN)
Borski	Cunningham	Franks (CT)
Boucher	Dannemeyer	Frost
Brewster	Darden	Gallely
Brooks	DeLauro	Gallo

Gaydos	Lloyd	Rinaldo
Gekas	Lowery (CA)	Roberts
Gephardt	Luken	Roe
Geren	Manton	Roemer
Gibbons	Martinez	Rogers
Gilchrist	Matsui	Rose
Gingrich	Mavroules	Rowland
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Roybal
Goss	McCandless	Sarpallius
Gray	McCloskey	Savage
Green	McCollum	Saxton
Guarini	McCrery	Schiff
Gunderson	McDade	Schumer
Hall (TX)	McEwen	Serrano
Hammerschmidt	McGrath	Shaw
Hansen	McHugh	Skaggs
Harris	McMillan (NC)	Skeen
Hastert	McMillen (MD)	Skelton
Hatcher	McNulty	Slaughter (VA)
Hayes (LA)	Michel	Smith (FL)
Hefner	Miller (OH)	Smith (IA)
Hobson	Miller (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Hochbrueckner	Mineta	Smith (OR)
Holloway	Mink	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Moakley	Spence
Hoyer	Molinari	Stallings
Hubbard	Mollohan	Stearns
Huckaby	Montgomery	Stenholm
Hughes	Morrison	Stokes
Hunter	Murtha	Stump
Hutto	Myers	Tanner
Hyde	Nagle	Tauzin
Inhofe	Natcher	Taylor (MS)
Ireland	Nichols	Taylor (NC)
Jefferson	Nussle	Thomas (CA)
Jenkins	Oakar	Thomas (GA)
Johnson (TX)	Olin	Thornton
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Torres
Kaptur	Orton	Torricelli
Kasich	Owens (UT)	Towns
Kennedy	Oxley	Trafigant
Kennelly	Packard	Volkmer
Kildee	Panetta	Vucanovich
Klug	Payne (VA)	Walker
Kolter	Pease	Walsh
Kopetski	Pelosi	Washington
Kyl	Perkins	Waxman
Lagomarsino	Pickett	Weber
LaRocco	Pickle	Wheat
Laughlin	Price	Whitten
Lehman (CA)	Pursell	Wilson
Lehman (FL)	Quillen	Wolf
Lent	Rahall	Wyllie
Levine (CA)	Rangel	Yates
Lewis (CA)	Ray	Yatron
Lewis (FL)	Rhodes	Young (AK)
Lightfoot	Richardson	Young (FL)
Livingston	Riggs	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Chandler	Horton
Aspin	Crane	Marlenee
AuCoin	de la Garza	Mrazek
Bacchus	Engel	Ramstad
Bonior	Hopkins	Staggers

□ 1754

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ramstad for, with Mr. Chandler against.

Messrs. HOUGHTON, FOGLIETTA, JEFFERSON, and SCHUMER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GOODLING, GILMAN, and PARKER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real

property or facility construction or expansion, \$305,071,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. To the extent that balances in the fund are not sufficient to cover amounts available for obligation in the account, the Secretary shall exercise his authority pursuant to section 302(e)(5) of said Act to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated, within available funds, not to exceed \$3,000,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada, for the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97-425, as amended, of which \$100,000 shall be available for the State Legislature's oversight activities: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated, not more than \$4,000,000 may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the Act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: *Provided further*, That the distribution of the funding herein provided between the affected units of local government shall be determined by the Department of Energy (DOE) and made available to the State and affected units of local government by direct payment: *Provided further*, That within 90 days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, each entity shall provide certification to the DOE, that all funds expended from such direct payment moneys have been expended for activities as defined in Public Law 97-425, as amended. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for any lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used for litigation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated herein, up to \$3,000,000 shall be available for infrastructure studies and other research and development work to be carried out by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and the University of Nevada, Reno. Funding to the universities will be administered by the DOE through a cooperative agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee for the fine work they have done with the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill.

I commend Chairman BEVILL for including two appropriations that I requested which are critical for erosion control and water supply in my home State of Montana.

Montana gave up many acres of fertile valley under the Fort Peck Reservoir and now is losing the remaining area to erosion. The mode of operation results in a wide variation in daily and seasonal stream flows. Erosion has been shown in the Corps of Engineers studies to be directly correlated to stream flows. The \$1.5 million the committee included for the corp to construct stream bank stabilization structures on this reach of the Missouri River will have a payback many times over. Including control structures that protect agricultural land, provide suitable areas for fish spawning and would ensure a reliable high quality municipal water supply and make construction of permanent recreation structures possible.

The committee also included \$2 million for the final design of the rehabilitation project of the Tongue River Dam located just north of the Montana-Wyoming border. The successful rehab program will allow for the resolution of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe reserved water right claims, correct a serious dam safety problem, and enhance the wildlife and fishery resources of the area.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about a couple of areas in which the committee has prioritized items in ways which I think run counter to either the administration's legitimate concerns or to directions that the authorizers have felt were necessary in our energy accounts.

For example, H.R. 2427 reduces the President's space program, the Department of Energy by about 42 percent. At the same time, the overall energy supply R&D account, from which the space programs are funded, increases by \$327 million, over 13 percent.

□ 1800

So you have a substantial increase in the account, and yet the committee felt necessary to cut back substantially on the President's efforts to involve primarily our national laboratories in a rather fascinating new major objective of supporting our space program.

Second, the committee has also seen fit once again this year to ignore the authorizing committee's efforts to have a line item for the hydrogen research. In fact, this year the committee has gone even further. Not only have they not done what the authorizing committee had specified and had a line item for hydrogen research, but they have cut below the funding levels of both the authorization and the President's budget, and, in fact, current levels of spending in hydrogen.

Now, that to me is a major concern, because hydrogen research is one of those alternative energy programs that we ought to be pursuing very vigorously. It is the one unlimited source of energy. What you have here, Mr. Chairman, is a situation where hydrogen research, an alternative energy that is both unlimited and totally clean burning, has been cut by this committee substantially.

Mr. Chairman, I understand what the committee was telling us earlier in the debate today about the fact they could not afford any new start programs. In this particular case what they have done is taken a program we have been doing for some years and producing valuable results, and cut it below current funding. I find that to be somewhat strange, given the nature of what we are attempting to achieve for the energy future of this country.

The reason why this was done is unclear to me. In the thermal and chemical storage line under the energy stor-

age system, which includes hydrogen, first of all, as I said, there was no separate line included. But then the bill earmarks money, more than the President requested, in seasonal thermal energy storage, and that results in about a \$300,000 cut to the hydrogen component.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very strange set of priorities. I am disturbed by it. I wish the committee would be a little more sensitive to what some of the authorizers do feel is in the best interest of the country. In this particular instance, I think that they have ill-served the future energy needs of the country.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The gentleman is making a very important point about priorities. Because of the issue which we have just discussed, massive amounts, hundreds of millions of dollars for the superconducting super collider, we are overall in our committee constrained. I know that they are in different lines, but it all comes out in the same wash. If we are going to engage on a 10-year, \$10 billion effort, these smaller efforts, which are environmentally sound, appropriate uses of America's cutting edge technology, are going to suffer.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to mention that for the RECORD. The hydrogen program is an excellent program. Yet, we are short at the edges. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for these mega projects, and the small initiatives that take advantage of our technology go underfunded.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for making a good point. The point here is that some of this money is actually committed to particular line items, and, yet, it comes out of the hydrogen energy program. That is disturbing.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, as my friend from New Jersey knows, I am seeking a declaration of non-navigability for pier A on the Hudson River, so that the city of New York can proceed with plans for the renovation of the pier. The pier is an old marine firehouse on the Hudson River in my district and will be vacated this fall. The effect of the declaration would be to waive the Federal Government's right to require removal of the pier without compensating the owners.

In assisting the city of New York with this project, it is my intention that the declaration of non-navigability still bind the project to the standard environmental and public interest review processes that are required by the Army Corps of Engineers.

I understand that the Committee on Public Works intends to hold a hearing on the declaration of non-navigability for pier A in the near future to examine the renovations planned for pier A and the effects of the declaration of non-navigability. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman if my understanding of the committee's intentions with respect to pier A is correct?

Mr. ROE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WEISS. I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of a letter the Army Corps of Engineers sent to me about the project:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
New York, NY.

Hon. TED WEISS,
Representative in Congress,
252 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY.

DEAR MR. WEISS. This responds to your March 24, 1991 and April 29, 1991 letters addressed to Mr. James Haggerty, Chief of the Eastern Permits Section, and follows up on our discussion at the close of the recent meeting on Prison Barge issues, regarding the proposed Pier A project and non-navigability declarations in the Hudson River near Battery Park in Lower Manhattan.

The Pier A project is presently in a pre-application stage. The proposal would involve conversion of the marine fire-fighting facility at Battery Park into a restaurant facility and would entail extensions of an existing deck over the Hudson River. On June 17, 1990, my Regulatory Branch staff met with representatives of the applicant and the New York City Public Development Corporation (NYCPDC) to discuss the project. Recently, representatives of NYCPDC have been in contact with my Regulatory Branch staff regarding their proposal to have the section of the Hudson River in the vicinity of Pier A declared non-navigable so that navigational servitude provisions, in case of a national emergency, would not apply to this pier. It is our understanding that the declaration of non-navigability is being sought to assist the project developers in obtaining financing for the project.

The Corps of Engineers generally discourages the declaration of areas within major waterbodies such as the Hudson River as non-navigable, as it restricts our abilities to ensure certain types of projects are not causing adverse navigational or environmental impacts. For these reasons, if such a declaration were to be authorized, we believe that language should be included in the legislation that the Department of the Army regulatory review process would still apply to projects in the area under the provisions of section 10 of the Rivers & Harbors Act of 1899, and all other applicable Federal regulations. In so doing, the concerns expressed by the New York City Clean Air Campaign will be allayed. Through issuance of a public notice describing the Pier A project or any other project proposed for the area, and conducting a public hearing if necessary, the public would have full opportunity to present their views and opinions.

We have reviewed the draft legislation enclosed with your April 29th letter and find it to be generally consistent with similar recent non-navigability declarations, including one for Lake Erie which protects the waterway from development that would be inconsistent with Federal laws enacted to protect navigational interests and the environment. The exact boundaries of the area of the Hudson River in question would need to be included in the legislation. We would request, however, that the legislation delete references requiring us to make the public interest determination within a specific time frame from the date of submission of appropriate plans for the project. Such a time restriction would likely hinder our ability to collect all available information regarding the project and perform a thorough public interest review.

While I trust this response provides the background information you need, a representative of this office is available to attend a meeting on this subject, if necessary. If you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact me or Mr. Joseph Seebode, Chief of the Regulatory Branch at (212) 264-3996.

Sincerely,

R.M. DANIELSON,
COLONEL, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
District Engineer.

I want to thank Chairman ROE for taking the time to discuss this matter, and I look forward to cooperating with the chairman and his staff in providing any further information needed.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging the chairman in a colloquy.

Last year, the House passed an amendment that I offered, and the chairman supported, to save the Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactor Program. This program aims at eliminating the export of highly enriched bomb-grade uranium, uranium that can be diverted and used to build a nuclear bomb by terrorists or states aggressively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, states such as Iraq, which have a long history of state sponsored terrorism.

Even now, the United Nations is trying to wrest from Saddam the bomb-grade uranium it possessed for so called peaceful purposes, enough uranium to build two nuclear bombs.

I would ask the chairman if he still thinks that an effort to minimize the amount of bomb-grade uranium in circulation is a worthy cause?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, yes, I do. The committee has included \$8 million in its bill for the RERTR Program to be administered by the DOE's International Affairs Division.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, would the chairman agree then that it is the express intent of Congress that the Department of En-

ergy use these funds to continue the RERTR Program?

Mr. BEVILL. I would.

Mr. SCHEUER. Will the chairman join me in urging that in the future consideration should be given to reviving the alternative fuel development program under which all U.S. export of bomb-grade uranium would be terminated?

Mr. BEVILL. I would. Termination of all bomb-grade uranium exports could go a long way toward protecting against nuclear terrorism.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In paying the amounts determined to be appropriate as a result of the decision in Consolidated Edison Company of New York v. Department of Energy 870 F.2d 694 (D.C. Cir. 1989), the Department of Energy shall pay interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and calculated from the date the amounts were deposited into the Nuclear Waste Fund. Such payments may be made by credits to future utility payments into the fund.

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FUND

Revenues received hereafter from the disposition of isotopes and related services shall be credited to this account, to be available for carrying out the purposes of the isotope production and distribution program without further appropriation: *Provided*, That such revenues and all funds provided under this head in Public Law 101-101 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That if at any time the amounts available to the fund are insufficient to enable the Department of Energy to discharge its responsibilities with respect to isotope production and distribution, the Secretary may borrow from amounts available in the Treasury, such sums as are necessary up to a maximum of \$8,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For expenses of the Department of Energy activities, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary for atomic energy defense activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 236 for replacement only including 13 police-type vehicles, and purchase of 4 rotary-wing aircraft, for replacement only), \$11,768,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$100,000,000 shall be for design of new production reactor capacity, to become available for obligation 60 days after issuance of the Record of Decision on the Environmental Impact Statement on New Production Reactor Capacity; and of which \$20,000,000 shall be made available to the State of New Mexico to assist the State and its affected units of local government in mitigating the environmental, social, economic, and other impacts resulting from the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant: *Provided*, That a portion of the \$20,000,000 received by the State of New Mexico may be provided directly to the affected units of local government in the vicinity of,

and along the transportation routes to, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant based on a State assessment of needs, conducted in consultation with its affected units of local government, and the demonstration of impacts: *Provided further*, That the \$20,000,000 shall be provided upon initiation of the performance assessment phase at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant site.

□ 1810

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: On page 38, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 39, line 15.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, according to the information that I have seen and that all of us have seen, more than half of the funds in this bill, about 55 percent or \$11.8 billion will be devoted to nuclear weapons programs.

Mr. Chairman, let us be very clear that despite the title of this bill, energy and water development appropriations, this bill is much more than just an appropriation for energy and water. It is a major appropriation for nuclear weapons.

As I understand this bill, approximately \$4.4 billion will go for weapons activities, including \$1.8 billion for research, development and testing; \$2.5 billion for production and surveillance; and \$164 million for program direction.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly how much of this \$11.8 billion is going for the development and production of new nuclear weapons as opposed to nuclear waste cleanup and other environmentally sound projects. I do not know that. But this I do know, I know that today there are over 5 million children in this country who are hungry. And I know that the WIC programs in Vermont and throughout this country are being grossly underfunded. I know that there are over 2 million people in this country who are sleeping out on the streets of America because the Federal Government over the last 12 years has drastically cut back on Federal aid for housing. I know that cities and towns and States all over this country are facing huge deficits because Federal aid to cities and States has been drastically cut.

I know that the President and the Congress last year authorized a \$43 billion cutback on Medicare over a 5-year period for the elderly, despite the fact that many of our elderly citizens are finding a very hard time in paying for their health care needs.

Mr. Chairman, there are obviously many valuable and positive aspects of this bill, money which goes for needed water projects, funding for the development of alternative energy sources, projects which would clean up nuclear waste dumps and defense facilities as well as many other valuable and needed projects.

Mr. Chairman, I want to support those projects. But I do not want to vote one penny more for the development, the production, or the testing of nuclear weapons. Mr. Chairman, the cold war is over and we do not need more nuclear weapons. The war we must concentrate on now is the war at home, the war against poverty, inadequate health care, the lack of educational opportunity, the lack of decent jobs and decent housing. That is the war we should be concentrating on, not preparing for a nuclear war.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support for my amendment which in essence asks the Appropriations Committee to bring us a new bill which separates the funding for nuclear weapons from the other components of this bill, many of which are quite laudable. If my amendment fails, I would urge a no vote on the entire bill.

Money for our children, yes. Money for our senior citizens, yes. Money for desperately needed domestic programs, yes. Money for nuclear weapons, no.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and urge that we have a no vote on this amendment.

This impacts the national security of our Nation, and if this amendment passes, it would unilaterally destroy the security of this country. So I urge a no vote.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee is well aware of many areas that are in need of money. However, the Budget Act of 1990 provides that we cannot take money from defense functions of our Government and put them over into domestic program as the author of this amendment suggests. The Budget Act of 1990 just positively prohibits that, so it will not do what the gentleman wishes it to do.

So we urge a no vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for Departmental Administration and other activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$35,000) \$414,976,000, to remain available until expended, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: *Provided*

further, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$284,352,000 in fiscal year 1992 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during fiscal year 1992 so as to result in a final fiscal year 1992 appropriation estimated at not more than \$130,624,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$31,431,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of projects in Alaska and of marketing electric power and energy, \$3,218,000, to remain available until expended.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for the purchase, maintenance and operation of two rotary-wing aircraft for replacement only; and for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$3,000.

During fiscal year 1992, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$23,869,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, and for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$28,464,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed \$8,820,000 in reimbursements, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (Public Law 95-91), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, \$306,478,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$278,173,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior

Reclamation fund; in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration \$5,465,000, to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles; official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$3,000); \$141,071,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter and notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$141,071,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 1992, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 1992, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1992 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. Appropriations for the Department of Energy under this title for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services. From these appropriations, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the United States Government for the performance of work for which this appropriation is made. None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriation Act. The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private, or foreign.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for Department of Energy activities funded in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise provided, shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such proposed transfers shall be submitted promptly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

(TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

SEC. 303. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

SEC. 304. (a) **FEDERAL FUNDING.**—The Secretary of Energy shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that at least 10 per centum of Federal funding for the development, construction, and operation of the Superconducting Super Collider be made available to business concerns or other organizations owned or controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a) (5) and (6))), including historically black colleges and universities and colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 20 percent of the students are Hispanic Americans or Native Americans. For purposes of this section, economically and socially disadvantaged individuals shall be deemed to include women.

(b) **OTHER PARTICIPATION.**—The Secretary of Energy shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure significant participation, in addition to that described in subsection (a), in the development, construction, and operation of the Superconducting Super Collider by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a) (5) and (6))) and economically disadvantaged women.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, notwithstanding section 405 of said Act, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$170,000,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$11,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), \$300,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), \$475,000.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the

Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), as amended by the Act of September 25, 1970 (Public Law 91-407), \$510,000, of which \$210,000 shall be available for the local sponsor's share of the cost of the United States Army Corps of Engineers Anacostia River and Tributaries study in Maryland and the District of Columbia or other activities associated with the restoration of the Anacostia River.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, official representation expenses (not to exceed \$20,000); reimbursements to the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, \$508,810,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$19,962,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That from this appropriation, transfer of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Commission for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, including criminal history checks under section 149 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, may be retained and used for salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$488,848,000 in fiscal year 1992 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1992 from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections, excluding those moneys received for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1992 appropriation estimated at not more than \$19,962,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$3,690,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, an amount not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: *Provided*, That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That from this

appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1992 from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1992 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$3,294,000, to be transferred from the Nuclear Waste Fund and to remain available until expended.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1541), \$284,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (84 Stat. 1530, 1531), \$310,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. ch. 12A), including purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for entering into contracts and making payments under section 11 of the National Trails System Act, as amended, \$135,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation and other moneys available to the Tennessee Valley Authority may be used hereafter for payment of the allowances authorized by section 5948 of title 5, United States Code.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 503. None of the programs, projects or activities as defined in the report accompanying this Act, may be eliminated or disproportionately reduced due to the application of "Savings and Slippage", "general reduction", or the provision of Public Law 99-177 or Public Law 100-119 unless such report expressly provides otherwise.

SEC. 504. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant

to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 505. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to implement a program of retention contracts for senior employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SEC. 506. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act or any other law shall be used for the purposes of conducting any studies relating or leading to the possibility of changing from the currently required "at cost" to a "market rate" or any other noncost-based method for the pricing of hydroelectric power by the six Federal public power authorities, or other agencies or authorities of the Federal Government, except as may be specifically authorized by Act of Congress hereafter enacted.

SEC. 507. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 508. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to implement the provisions of Public Law 101-576.

Mr. BEVILL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 54, line 21, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of the bill?

Are there any amendments to the remainder of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANNEMEYER

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANNEMEYER: Page 54, insert after line 21 the following new section:

SEC. 509. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 0.50 percent.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Members here a question. The question I would like to ask the Members of the House that are in the Chamber is a simple one.

How many of my colleagues have gone to their districts and appeared at a town hall forum, and in response to a question from somebody there said that they supported a balanced budget for the U.S. Government? Members do not have to show their hands, but I suspect that many in the Chamber would have been alert to say to their constituents that, "Why, I support a balanced budget amendment for the U.S. Government."

This amendment gives Members that chance to give life to that statement

they have given to their constituents low these many years that they have made statements in town hall forums, because the reality is that over this 102d Congress every authorization bill or appropriation bill is going to have an amendment offered to it to limit growth. Please hear me, I did not say cut anything. I said limit growth, 1992 over 1991, 1993 over 1992, to no more than 2.4 percent.

This bill in the form that it is before us has growth, 1992 over 1991 by 2.9 percent, so the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to reduce the growth by a half a percentage point to 2.4, 1992 over 1991. This would still let spending increase 1992 over 1991 by \$499 million. It still tolerates that much growth. But it does reduce that growth by some \$107 million.

That is what this amendment is all about.

Back in February of 1989, a little over 2 years ago, this Member took the well of the House and advised the Members we were going to have a rollover vote, up or down, on something that would come before the House on the issue of the pay increase. Do my colleagues recall? I advised my colleagues that whether there was a motion to adjourn, or whether there was a ruling of nongermaneness and an appealing of the ruling of the Chair, or whatever, there would be a rollover vote. And the effort on the part of the House to finess and avoid that vote was the motion to adjourn, and we defined that issue across this country as the definitive rollover vote on the pay raise. And because it was defined that way, the pay raise, at least in February of 1989, was defeated.

So I am suggesting that every Member should understand that across this country this vote today will be the defining vote on whether or not Members want to vote for a balanced budget.

□ 1820

Because the reality is that if we limit growth to 2.4 percent year over year, in 5 years with that modest level of discipline, we will have a balanced budget, and we will get there not by raising taxes, not by taking a meat ax and cutting anything out, just modestly slowing down the rate of growth of Federal spending. That is what this amendment does.

I ask for an aye vote.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I do rise in support of the Dannemeyer amendment, and I have been keeping a close watch on both the budget and appropriation processes this year.

I see some very positive signs and some that are not so good. I am pleased we have so far at least stayed within the constraints of last fall's budget agreement. The appropriations subcommittees seem to be making trade-

offs staying within their allocations and, in fact, maintaining their budget caps. This year the job of the appropriations committees has not been easy. They are to be commended for their hard work including members of this committee reporting today's bill.

That does not mean everything is rosy. I still remain very concerned about our inexcusable deficit and the possibility of new taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for today's energy and water bill because it stays within the budget caps and increases spending at less than the rate of inflation, but there are aspects of the bill that I do find upsetting.

The bill contains \$209 million net surplus in the uranium enrichment fund created by reducing the President's proposed spending levels. I understand this surplus remains in the uranium fund, and that is an important fact, because in adding up this spending in this bill, the surplus is used to offset \$200 million of increased spending in other accounts. In reality, this \$200 million of increased spending will not be offset by a surplus in the uranium fund. It will eventually come from taxes or the deficit.

Rather than spending \$100 million less than the President, this bill may actually spend \$100 million more.

In another place, the bill assumes over \$230 million of what is called savings in slippage in Army Corps projects. While this is a reasonable way to account for spending that falls behind schedule, the bill's estimate is \$42 million more than the administration's estimate.

I found little information in the committee report to evaluate which, if either, estimate is legitimate. Because savings in slippage effectively reduces the overall cost of the bill, it is a tempting way to hide spending.

Neither of these two examples looks like honest accounting.

Finally this, and apparently other appropriation bills, would prevent the executive branch from spending any money on implementing the Chief Financial Officer Act. Congress clearly wanted to improve the Federal Government's financial management when it passed this act last year. We should not now be using this backdoor method to thwart our own goal.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work this year. I urge my fellow Members to support today's and any future efforts to reduce the budget deficit.

While I support the overall bill, I rise in support of this amendment, because there are several projects in the bill that would be exempt from cost sharing. These projects will take resources that could otherwise be used to reduce the deficit or provide the Federal share for other projects.

Mr. Chairman, I realize, under limited circumstances, some projects

should be exempt from cost sharing; communities hit particularly hard by natural disasters or other major blows deserve our unconditional support, but some of the exempted projects in this bill do not appear to meet this level of need, especially when the value of the exemption may reach almost \$400 million.

Cost sharing is a sound concept and should be used for all but especially needy projects.

I support this amendment to reduce spending within the bill with the express hope that it comes from those projects taking more than their fair share.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to vote "no." This is another one of those typical meat-ax approaches.

This bill is under the President's budget. We are under the budget summit agreement. We are under the 602(b) allocation. We are under every kind of limitation that has been placed on this bill. It was not easy to do that.

We would appreciate a no vote on this.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]: How much are we scheduled to increase the national debt by this year?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, in this bill, we have no increase in the national debt.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. No; no.

Mr. BEVILL. We are under all our allocations.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. What is the projected increase in the national debt this year?

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman and I can talk about that sometime when it is appropriate, because actually this bill is under all limitations that there are, the President's budget, Congress' budget, 602(b), and everything you can think of; we are under it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Four-tenths of a trillion dollars is the amount we are increase the national debt by, and all I am suggesting is that if we modestly limit the growth over 5 years, we can get to a balanced budget which I am sure the gentleman supports.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his point. That is the point here, I would say to my colleagues. This is the balanced-budget amendment.

The gentleman from Alabama is absolutely correct. They are under the President's budget. They are under the House budget. They are under everything that we have in terms of a standard around here. They have done fine.

The problem is in even meeting those standards we do not get anywhere close to a balanced budget.

Last year when we discussed the balanced-budget amendment and the Constitution, there were a number of Members who came to the floor and suggested that what we had to have was the courage to cast the tough votes.

I do not think it is particularly tough to vote for something that suggests we are going to increase spending over last year by 2.4 percent. This is what the gentleman from California has recommended to the House, that we simply increase spending by a more modest amount than what the committee is going to increase spending, and in so doing put ourselves on a track toward a balanced budget. That is what balancing budgets is all about.

Some Members do not really care about balanced budgets. They are more interested in spending the money, making certain that their project gets funded, and so on, and they do not probably want to vote for the Dannemeyer amendment. A lot are probably going to vote differently.

If, in fact, you have been talking about balanced budgets, and if that is the high priority for you, and it is the high priority with me, I suggest you want to support the Dannemeyer amendment and other balanced-budget amendments that will come to the floor, because I think it is high time to begin testing the House on the issue of whether or not when it comes to balanced budgets whether you are really willing to vote that way day after day and week after week.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I intend to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 92, noes 320, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

AYES—92

Archer	Bunning	Doolittle
Army	Burton	Dornan (CA)
Ballenger	Camp	Dreier
Barrett	Campbell (CA)	Duncan
Bennett	Coble	Fawell
Bentley	Condit	Gekas
Bilirakis	Cooper	Gilchrest
Boehlert	Cox (CA)	Gingrich
Broomfield	Dannemeyer	Glickman
Bruce	Dickinson	Gradison

Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hefley
Henry
Hobson
Holloway
Hunter
Hutto
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jontz
Kasich
Kyl
Lewis (FL)
Martin
McCollum
McEwen

Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Murphy
Nichols
Nussle
Packard
Patterson
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Ravenel
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Santorum

NOES—320

Abercrombie
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
Baker
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bliley
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early

Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hyde
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza

Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shays
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Tallon
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Zeliff

Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McNulty
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinaro
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)

Oxley
Pallone
Pannetta
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo

Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpaliss
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmere
Vucanovich
Washington
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Aspin
AuCoin
Bacchus
Chandler
Crane
de la Garza

Engel
Hopkins
Horton
Lehman (FL)
Marlenee
Mrazek
Ramstad

Rangel
Scheuer
Skelton
Staggers
Waters

□ 1845

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chandler for, with Mr. Engel against.

Mr. Ramstad for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GINGRICH was allowed to proceed out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked to speak out of order to receive word on the schedule from the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I simply want Members to know there is a change in the schedule in that we will be meeting tomorrow on the military construction appropriation bill. We will be proceeding, we hope, to the Rules Committee tomorrow on the civil rights matter, but there will not be votes on Friday.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might, will there be votes on Monday, does the gentleman know at this stage?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there will be votes toward the end of the day on Monday.

Mr. GINGRICH. Do we know at the present time, will those be on suspensions or on appropriations?

Mr. GEPHARDT. They will be on suspensions.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me also if I might just ask the distinguished majority leader two questions.

There is some interest on our side on scheduling work on a crime bill. As the gentleman knows, that is one of the President's top priorities. I understand there is some talk on the gentleman's side that we are beginning to look toward maybe a day certain or some such possibility.

Could the gentleman advise the House at all on that particular opportunity?

Mr. GEPHARDT. As the gentleman may know, the committee is meeting and working on the bill and various parts of the bill. We will be advising all the Members as soon as we can come toward specific dates for consideration of parts or the entire bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. The last thing I want to say on the civil rights bill, as the gentleman knows, the President has said several times he very much wants to sign a civil rights bill and on our side we very much want to work with you to be able to pass a bill which is signable.

I guess I would just like to take this opportunity to put into the RECORD a very deep concern on our side of the aisle that we get a rule which is fair and which allows the Republican side to offer a clean and untainted alternative as that is developed. I would hope as we go to the Rules Committee tomorrow that we could work with you to develop a rule which we could support and which would offer that kind of a fair alternative built around the President's bill that he sent up.

□ 1850

Mr. GEPHARDT. I understand the gentleman's statement, and we will try to work with the leadership on the other side to fashion a rule.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1992".

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PARNETTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 392, noes 24, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

AYES—392

Abercrombie
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Armey
Atkins
Baker
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Billey
Boehert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan

Camp
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Durbin

Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fasell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gedjenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison

Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kliczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levin (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowery (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markay
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery

McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo

Sabo
Santorum
Sarpalilus
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarez
Spence
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallion
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsold
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—24

Archer
Ballenger
Burton
Campbell (CA)
Coble

Dreier
Duncan
Hancock
Hefley
Henry

Huckaby
Jacobs
Johnston
Nussle
Petri

Ritter	Sensenbrenner	Solomon
Roth	Shays	Stump
Sanders	Slattery	Walker

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Crane	Lehman (FL)
Aspin	de la Garza	Marlenee
AuCoin	Engel	Mrazek
Bacchus	Hopkins	Ramstad
Chandler	Horton	Staggers

□ 1908

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chandler for, with Mr. Ramstad against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I fulfilled a 4-year-old commitment by attending the graduation ceremony of the class of 1991, U.S. Air Force Academy.

This commitment, made in 1987 to motivate a struggling first-year-cadet and close family friend, who had been abandoned by his own father at an early age, caused me to miss three votes on H.R. 2427, energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1991.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the Slattery amendment regarding the superconducting super collider; "yes" on the Dannemeyer amendment to cut spending across the board; and "no" on final passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely proud of all five young men from Minnesota's Third Congressional District who are part of the Air Force Academy's 33d graduating class: Anthony Baade, Jeffrey Landreth, Kent Landreth, Mike Parent, and Diego Wendt. As I watched President Bush confer degrees upon all 968 graduates and spent time visiting with many of these new Air Force second lieutenants, I was reassured that the future of our military and our great country is very bright with these outstanding young leaders.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my votes on rollcall numbers 118 and 119. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on the Dannemeyer amendment to H.R. 2427 and "yes" on final passage of the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote on rollcall No. 119 because I was in my district with my wife, Rebecca, and my daughter, Jamey Rebecca, who was born at 8:17 p.m. on Monday, May 27, 1991. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 119.

NATIONAL PEARL HARBOR REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) to designate December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1910

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], who is the chief sponsor of this joint resolution.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my staunch support for House Joint Resolution 72, "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day."

As we approach the 50th anniversary of this sad episode in American history, I believe it is incumbent upon all Americans to take a moment and remember the sacrifices our fighting soldiers made for our country.

The lessons of Pearl Harbor must be clear, so that our Nation is never again taken by surprise. We must always be prepared. Our defenses must always be strong. And we must teach future generations the lessons of history.

Before I entered public service, I taught high school history for 16 years. One of the principles I always tried to drive home to my students was the importance of learning from the past.

Indeed, as the philosopher George Santayana once said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." We owe it to our Nation's veterans, to the families of those who perished at Pearl Harbor and to our children to remember December 7, 1941, as the day President Roosevelt said "would live in infamy."

We owe it to all of our nation's veterans, including the brave men and women who fought in Desert Storm, to commemorate their sacrifice and valor and thank them for the work they did for our country.

I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. MONTGOMERY, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, for his support on this issue. And I also want to thank Mr. SAWYER of Ohio and Mr. RIDGE of Pennsylvania for their support in the Subcommittee on Census and Population.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of a

joint resolution designating December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day," and I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], the sponsor of this resolution.

Every generation has a day forever emblazoned in its consciousness. For my parents, it was the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month in 1918, when the guns fell silent on the western front of Europe. For another generation, it was an autumn afternoon when the crack of gunfire snuffed out the life of our young, vibrant President Kennedy in a Dallas motorcade.

But for my generation, the day we will never forget was 50 years ago, when a quiet Sunday was interrupted by the shocking news that the Japanese Empire had launched an unexpected, unprovoked air attack upon our naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Anyone who was around on December 7, can tell you exactly where they were and what they were doing when those deadly bombs fell. Other images of that day are vivid in all of our minds: the thousands of American soldiers, sailors, and airmen performing personal acts of heroism in the midst of that sudden vicious attack, and a Nation suddenly united with a common purpose.

There is another lingering thought about Pearl Harbor. The knowledge that we must never again allow the oceans along our shorelines to lull us into a sense of complacency—that never again should we allow our national defense to be so ill-prepared for any hostile action. From December 7, 1941 on, we Americans knew that we would have to strengthen our defenses and bear the mantle of world leadership, recognizing that events anywhere in the world would henceforth affect us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that December 7, 1991, is an appropriate time for our Nation to take a moment and remember the important and unforgettable lesson that Pearl Harbor Day taught us—that never again can we allow ourselves to be unprepared.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution that commemorates the 50th anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. As a World War II veteran and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am proud to be an original cosponsor and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] for bringing it to the floor today.

I also want to especially thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] for his efforts in introducing the resolution and working to get it to the House floor.

Plans are already underway to properly commemorate the December 7, 1941, bombing of Pearl Harbor. It is one of the most important dates in our country's history and certainly is deserving of this designation.

By passing this resolution, we will be honoring the more than 2,000 U.S. citizens killed in

the attack and the more than 1,000 who were wounded. And because this bombing marked the entry of the United States into World War II, we will also be honoring the bravery and the sacrifice of all the veterans of the World War II era.

I think we need this resolution to help bring attention once again to the Pearl Harbor bombing for the millions of Americans who were not yet born at the time of the attack. It is important that younger Americans are made aware of what happened on that early Sunday morning in 1941 and how those events helped change the course of history.

Once again, I want to voice my support for this resolution and I urge its passage.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

Whereas, on December 7, 1941, the Imperial Japanese Navy and Air Force attacked units of the United States Armed Forces stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii;

Whereas more than 2000 citizens of the United States were killed, and more than 1000 citizens of the United States were wounded, in the attack on Pearl Harbor;

Whereas the attack on Pearl Harbor marked the entry of the United States into World War II;

Whereas December 7, 1991, is the 50th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor;

Whereas the veterans of World War II and all other people of the United States will commemorate December 7, 1991, in remembrance of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas commemoration of the attack on Pearl Harbor will instill in all people of the United States a greater understanding and appreciation of the selfless sacrifice of the individuals who served in the United States Armed Forces during World War II: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That December 7, 1991, is designated as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYME DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 138) designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 138.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing the area with the most reported cases of Lyme disease in the country, I am delighted that the House is considering legislation today designating the week of July 23 through July 30 as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week." I want to thank the more than 230 cosponsors of this bill for the support that enabled the bill to be brought to the floor today.

Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN of Connecticut has for the third year introduced the companion bill to this legislation and expects that the Senate will consider this measure shortly. I appreciate this opportunity to provide my colleagues with some background on this disease and why the designation of this week is so important.

While most people have heard of Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, a disease transmitted by a tick that affects about 700 people a year, there is a far more common tick-borne disease that has only recently received the attention that it demands—Lyme disease. Lyme disease is a bacterial infection that is spread by a tick the size of a comma in newsprint. Although Lyme disease was first officially reported just 16 years ago in Lyme, CT, it has fast become the most common tick-borne disease and one of the fastest spreading new infectious diseases in the United States.

Since 1982, over 30,500 cases have been reported to the Centers for Disease Control [CDC]. From 1986 to 1989, nationally reported cases of Lyme disease doubled or nearly doubled each year. The CDC recently announced that there were just under 8,000 cases of Lyme disease reported in 1990. While this number is approximately 550 cases—or 6.5 percent—less than the final number reported for 1989, it is expected that, as has occurred in previous years, over 500 late reports will be received after the publication of the first provisional number. The number of cases for 1990 is more than triple the number reported in 1987, and more than 15 times the number reported in 1982, the year that CDC began keeping statistics on this disease.

My own State, New York, has reported more than 3,200 cases per year in 1989 and 1990, which represents over 40 percent of the Nation's total cases of Lyme disease. According to the CDC, New York's incidence rate for this disease of 18 cases/100,000 people is second only to Connecticut with an incident rate of 21 per 100,000. Although the Northeast remains the heaviest hit

area for this disease, Lyme disease is no longer thought to be just a regional problem. Lyme disease cases have been reported from 47 States, including Alaska and Hawaii. However, because diagnosis is difficult and public awareness about the disease is still limited, the CDC estimates that thousands of cases have gone undiagnosed, unreported, and worse yet, untreated.

Lyme disease is sometimes called the Great Impostor because it can mimic the symptoms of other ailments such as ringworm, influenza, arthritis, or heart disease. Symptoms of Lyme disease in its early stages include a characteristic rash at the site of the tick bite, headaches, fever, pains in joints, and swollen glands. Left untreated, Lyme disease can cause partial facial paralysis—Bell's palsy—meningitis, encephalitis, an abnormal slowing of the heartbeat, severe headaches and depression, destructive arthritis, memory loss, chronic fatigue, and numbness or shooting pains in the arms and legs.

Many people never even know that they have been bitten by this tick because it is so small. The parasite can attach itself, feed, detach itself to lay its eggs, all without host's knowledge. Moreover, a person might not develop the telltale rash at the site of the tick bite, leaving the person without a clue as to the cause of the ailment. Moreover, standard blood tests often do not reveal the presence of the spirochete. Because Lyme disease was only first recognized in the United States in 1975, physicians who do not see many cases of the disease may have difficulty in diagnosing or treating it. However, with proper diagnosis and early treatment Lyme disease can be cured with antibiotic therapy.

As early treatment of Lyme disease is the key to warding off its worst effects, and as there is currently no vaccine for Lyme disease, the best defense against it is prevention. That is why education is vital if we are to minimize the effects of this painful disease. The American public must know what to look for if they are to take precaution against this disease.

Mr. Speaker, the prevention of Lyme disease depends upon public awareness. The designation of the week July 23 through the 30 as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week" will help us to alert the general public and health care professionals to Lyme disease and its symptoms.

□ 1920

Again, I thank Members for signing on to this very worthy resolution. Hopefully we will continue the education process that has gone on for the past 4 years, and in the future, we will take the appropriate measures, financially, also as a Nation, to see to the resolution and the cure for Lyme disease, the second fastest growing infec-

tious disease in the Nation, second only to AIDS.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of a joint resolution designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER], for his continual sponsorship and diligent efforts to reduce Lyme disease and to better educate the public with regard to the dangers of this disease.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee and ranking minority member for bringing the measure to the floor in this timely manner.

Lyme disease, as you may know, is transmitted by a small, little-known tick species which have become abundant in a large part of my district. In 1982, there were 60 reported cases of Lyme disease in my 22d Congressional District of New York; by 1989, there were 1,731 cases and the actual number may be several times higher. Over the past few years the number of reported cases have increased not decreased.

Although Lyme disease was first officially reported just 14 years ago in Lyme, CT, it has fast become the most common tick-borne disease and one of the fastest spreading infectious diseases in the United States. If treated early, the disease can be cured by antibiotic therapy; however, early diagnosis is often thwarted by the disease's resemblance to the flu and other less dangerous ailments. Indeed, without early treatment, a victim of Lyme disease can expect severe arthritis, heart disease, or neurologic complications. Later effects, often occurring months or years after the initial onset of the disease, include destructive arthritis and chronic neurological disease. If it were not for AIDS, Lyme disease would be the No. 1 infectious disease facing us today.

I believe the primary effective way to control Lyme disease is by educating the public on how to take precautions against tick bites and by being aware of symptoms associated with the disease.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the New York Medical College in Valhalla, NY, for their extensive, significant Lyme disease research.

I feel July 21, 1991, is an appropriate time to inform the public of Lyme disease and its dangers. As a representative of the people in my district, I believe it is in their best interest to educate them of the dangers and prevention of Lyme disease.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the gentlemen from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. GILMAN] in supporting Lyme Disease Awareness Week.

Westchester County accounts for nearly one-quarter of the Nation's reported Lyme disease cases. A recent study of several communities in Westchester revealed that 80 percent of the residential properties in the community were infested with deer ticks. In fact, in the first 4 months of 1991, there has been an 83-percent increase in Lyme disease cases over last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Americans to take time during Lyme Disease Awareness Week to know the symptoms and know the early warning signs of the rapidly spreading disease, because this is the second most rapidly spreading health problem in the United States. It is absolutely essential that we recognize this and that we commit resources to ending this threat.

Mr. Speaker, the disease's symptoms can resemble the flu, arthritis, and ringworm. As it progresses, it may cause severe arthritis, heart disease, and neurological disorders. In untreated cases, the disease can lead to blindness and even death. The fear of complications is exacerbated by the fact that many people do not even know when they have Lyme disease, because it is so difficult to diagnose.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited support groups in my district where people meet just to help each other understand the problems with this disease. There are youngsters that are continually going to school with injections which help ease the pain. There are youngsters that have pain which is similar to arthritis.

The deer tick which carries the Lyme spirochete is so small that many people do not even know that they are bitten. There are those that are being accused of having some imaginary disease, when they are truly suffering real pain.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that preventive measures can help save money in the long run and improve the quality of life. One of the most logical ways to prevent Lyme disease is to curb the growth of infected tick populations. Research has shown that the current epidemic of Lyme disease reflects dramatic increases in deer tick populations which continue to spread at dangerously high rates.

Mr. Speaker, if we are really serious about fighting Lyme disease, we must take steps to curb the growth of the infected deer tick population. The New York Medical College is deeply involved in promising work in the field of population ecology of deer ticks. Their goal is to find new ways of controlling the spread of Lyme disease by curbing the spread of infected ticks. Their medical entomology lab is world renowned for its expertise in tick repro-

duction and for its work on finding ecological factors to reduce infected tick populations. Researchers at the college are currently conducting studies not being done anywhere else. Certainly they have a laboratory surrounding them.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when Lyme disease no longer causes suffering for so many. I am very proud to join Members in supporting Lyme Disease Awareness Week.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and commend these Members for bringing this matter before the Chamber. This is a disease that has grown almost exponentially over the past couple of years. It is enormously painful. It is very difficult to detect. It strikes the most vulnerable among us, our youth, our children. Early detection still means a rather painful session of treatment. Much later detection can involve very, very prolonged therapy, and a myriad of different kinds of treatment, because it affects so much of your anatomy.

If public awareness is the best means of prevention, then certainly these Members deserve our gratitude and support for making this effort to make the public more aware of the disease, its complications, its potential for great pain and suffering, and a knowledgeable public hopefully can prevent this disease from affecting so many of our children.

□ 1930

So I commend our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 138

Whereas Lyme disease (borreliosis) is spread primarily by the bite of four types of ticks infected with the bacteria *Borrelia burgdorferi*;

Whereas Lyme disease-carrying ticks can be found across the country—in woods, mountains, beaches, even in our yards, and no effective tick control measures currently exist;

Whereas infected ticks can be carried by animals such as cats, dogs, horses, cows, goats, birds, and transferred to humans;

Whereas our pets and livestock can be infected with Lyme disease by ticks;

Whereas Lyme disease was first discovered in Europe in 1883 and scientists have recently proven its presence on Long Island as early as the 1940's;

Whereas Lyme disease was first found in Wisconsin in 1969, and derives its name from the diagnosis of a cluster of cases in the mid-1970's in Lyme, Connecticut;

Whereas forty-six States reported twenty-two thousand five hundred and thirty-eight cases of Lyme disease from 1982 through 1989;

Whereas Lyme disease knows no season—the peak west coast and southern season is November to June, the peak east coast and

northern season is April to October, and victims suffer all year round.

Whereas Lyme disease, easily treated soon after the bite with oral antibiotics, can be difficult to treat (by painful intravenous injections) if not discovered in time, and for some may be incurable;

Whereas Lyme disease is difficult to diagnose because there is no reliable test that can directly detect when the infection is present;

Whereas the early symptoms of Lyme disease may include rashes, severe headaches, fever, fatigue, and swollen glands;

Whereas if left untreated Lyme disease can affect every body system causing severe damage to the heart, brain, eyes, joints, lungs, liver, spleen, blood vessels, and kidneys;

Whereas the bacteria can cross the placenta and affect fetal development;

Whereas our children are the most vulnerable and most widely affected group;

Whereas the best cure for Lyme disease is prevention;

Whereas prevention of Lyme disease depends upon public awareness;

Whereas education is essential to making the general public, health care professionals, employers, and insurers more knowledgeable about Lyme disease and its debilitating side effects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning July 21, 1991 is designated as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 72 and House Joint Resolution 138, the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE NEW KILLING FIELDS IN BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, a year would have passed since the people of Burma went to the polls to vote for the first time in more than 30 years. To the surprise of Burma's military regime, the National League for Democracy [NLD] won 392 of the 485 seats contested in the election. Sadly, the NLD's election victory proved to be short lived. The SLORC—the State Law and Order Restoration Council—

an ominous name, in other words, Burma's military junta annulled the elections and declared itself as possessing all legislative, judicial, and administrative powers. The National League for Democracy [NLD], is now described as being virtually a corpse with its leaders under arrest, including Aung San Suu Kyi—40 percent of elected members, its national legislature, have been jailed, two tortured to death and many in exile. Aung San Suu Kyi has been held incommunicado since July 1990. The whereabouts of her children are unknown. Her husband is here in the United States. It is apparent that the regime will not accept the results of a democratic election and transfer power in any form to a freely elected government.

The military regime continues to detain political opponents and have failed to answer serious persistent allegations of torture and mistreatment of prisoners. Thousands of people have been arrested, executed and disappeared since the revolution and subsequent crackdown of September 1988—when millions of Burmese demanded an end to the 26-year-old military dictatorship of Ne Win. Young Burmese males live in fear of being taken away as porters where they are used as human mine sweepers or forced to assist the military regime to carry army supplies until they die of exhaustion.

A new "Killing Fields" is underway in Burma.

In January, the State Department in its annual country report on Human Rights Practices, stated that torture, disappearances, arbitrary arrests, and detentions, unfair trials and compulsory labor, among other violations still persists. On the whole, "treatment of the population remained capricious and apparently unrestrained by legal, institutional or moral considerations".

Meanwhile, an estimated 50,000 Burmese and at least 4,000 Burmese students have fled to the Thai-Burma border since September 1988. Reports have cited forced repatriation of Burmese asylum seekers by Thai authorities to Burma. This type of planned deportation and border closure contravenes the principle of nonrefoulement. No government should send an individual to a country where they would be at risk of serious human rights violations, or reject the entry of someone facing such risks. As recent as last week, Thai military authorities reportedly announced plans to repatriate almost 20,000 illegal immigrants, asylum seekers, and refugees in Tak Province to Burma by the end of May. These refugees undoubtedly face death, torture or imprisonment if they return home. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to think only of the publicity that is now being given to Kurds as they face up to the reality of killing with Saddam Hussein and realize that people of the Burma-Thai border face exact the same kind of horrendous

consequences. Although Thai authorities have allowed temporary safe haven to thousands of Burmese refugees, including the students, it refuses to permit comprehensive U.N. protection and assistance for these people in Thailand.

The constant threat of repatriation of Burmese refugees by Thai authorities is an issue of tremendous concern to the United States which must be expressed to the Government of Thailand.

Last October, Congress passed a law imposing sanctions on Burma if it did not release all political prisoners; transfer political power to the elected representatives of the People's assembly; take significant steps in eradicating the drug trade in Burma's portion of the Golden Triangle and embark on basic improvements in its human rights record.

Burma has yet to comply with any of these requirements, and the President has not made a decision to impose economic sanctions.

The Senate recently passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 which expresses the concern of the Senate for the ongoing human rights abuses in Burma.

□ 1940

This resolution has been referred to the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all my colleagues, and particularly those on the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, to investigate and expose the appalling human-rights record of the military regime in Burma.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to carry out the will of the Congress and speak out against the atrocities that are being committed by the Burmese military regime. The United States needs to demonstrate its stand for democracy and human rights for all the people of the world including the Burmese people. A word of solidarity from the President broadcast on the Voice of America into Burma will give hope to the victims of human rights violations and their families, and I hope they can hear us speaking as free people in this free country today.

I hope they hear us in Burma. We are with them.

The President's failure to speak out means that the United States is forgoing an opportunity to strengthen pressure on the ruling military regime. Being silent will send the wrong message to the Burmese people, to the regime now in power, and to the international community.

The Australian Government over the weekend has announced that Australia would seek support for an arms embargo against Burma from China and Singapore, two countries named in a secret intelligence report as suspected military backers of the Burmese regime, still another reason to take into

account the most-favored-nation status on trade for China.

The United States is a major player in the United Nations and needs to take a leading role in encouraging other countries to implement economic and trade sanctions against Burma.

The administration should open resettlement opportunities for Burmese students who are without safe and reasonable alternatives to enter the United States. We need a call for hearings to investigate and publicize the plight of Burmese refugees. The continuing danger of massive repatriation, the forced prostitution of young Burmese women and girls as the Burmese economy worsens; we need, finally, before any concrete form of relations in terms of aid or other kinds of assistance, to call for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, the duly elected leader in Burma, and the release of all political prisoners. This is imperative.

The military regime in Burma must respect international standards of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying that Suu Kyi has been nominated for the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize by Czech President Vaclav Havel. This illustrates the international support in recognition of the plight of the Burmese people.

We cannot turn our backs, Mr. Speaker, on the Burmese people or on the cause of freedom anywhere.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON BUDGET REGARDING REVISED FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS, PURSUANT TO SECTION 12 OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, section 12 of the conference report on the fiscal year 1992 budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 121, sets forth a procedure for revising the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal year 1991 to make them consistent with discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This section is applicable only to the House of Representatives; the Senate has already revised the fiscal year 1991 figures under a similar procedure, applicable only to the Senate, established in section 13112(f) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The major purpose of the fiscal year 1991 revision is to effectuate the new pay-as-you-go requirement. Under pay-as-you-go, the baseline at the start of this session of Congress is the starting point against which all direct spending and revenue legislation is measured. The pay-as-you-go requirement is enforced by sequestration. But the Budget Enforcement Act amended both the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985—Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—and the Congressional Budget Act, so that the pay-as-you-go concept would be enforced through both sequestration and congressional procedures. Therefore, budget resolutions should set targets for revenues and direct spending equal to the baseline, although increases and decreases netting to zero are permissible.

Current committee direct spending and revenue targets were set in last fall's budget resolution, before the final legislation for the session was completed. Therefore, there is not a perfect match for each committee; some committees are above the baseline, some are below. The new aggregates and allocations that I am filing today correct the mismatches, setting all direct spending and revenues exactly at the current baseline—using CBO estimates. It should be noted that, while CBO estimates that the current fiscal year 1991 baseline is above the start-of-year baseline by \$6 million, OMB estimates no fiscal year 1991

overage; therefore, there would be no need for any fiscal year 1991 pay-as-you-go offsets if OMB estimates had been used.

For discretionary appropriations, the new allocation exactly equals the sum of the existing discretionary caps.

Adding the discretionary caps to the baseline level of direct spending and revenues produces an on-budget deficit exactly equal to CBO's estimate of the fiscal year 1991 GRH deficit target, or maximum deficit amount.

Since fiscal year 1991 is already two-thirds completed, committees are likely to report very few additional bills affecting this fiscal year. Therefore, the requirement to subdivide the fiscal year 1991 allocations is set aside and section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 121 further provides that Budget Act enforcement related to allocations—section 302(f) points of order and section 401(b)(2) referrals—will be based on the total fiscal year 1991 spending and credit allocations for each committee, as set forth in this submission.

In order to facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I will shortly submit to the House a revised current level report for fiscal year 1991, reflecting the changes in budget aggregates and allocations set forth in this submission.

The revised budget aggregates and allocations for fiscal year 1991 authorized by section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 121 follow:

Fiscal year 1991 Budget aggregates

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

New budget authority	1,187,800
Outlays	1,155,800
Revenues	793,000
Deficit	362,800

FISCAL YEAR 1991 302(a) ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEES, INCLUDING DETAIL RELATING TO DEFENSE, INTERNATIONAL, AND DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

House committee	BA	Out	NEA	DL	LG
Appropriations:					
Discretionary:					
Defense	289,918	298,848			
International	20,100	19,392			
Domestic	182,891	200,321			
Subtotal	492,909	518,561		6,129	72,593
Mandatory	203,417	197,736		0	0
Total	696,326	716,297	0	6,129	72,593
Agriculture:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	12,637	13,812		8,160	8,213
Armed Services:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	47,852	34,105		0	0
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	93,805	98,502		2,830	141
District of Columbia:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	18	18		0	0
Education and Labor:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	127	120		0	12,487
Energy and Commerce:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	14,476	12,720		0	260
Foreign Affairs:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	12,343	10,649		0	0
Government Operations:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	20	18		0	0

FISCAL YEAR 1991 302(a) ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEES, INCLUDING DETAIL RELATING TO DEFENSE, INTERNATIONAL, AND DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS—Continued

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

House committee	BA	Out	NEA	DL	LG
House Administration:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	44	34		0	0
Interior and Insular Affairs:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	1,766	1,115		0	0
Judiciary:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	1,998	2,604		0	0
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	527	486		0	104
Post Office and Civil Service:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	69,081	45,245		0	0
Public Works and Transportation:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	18,260	631		340	0
Science, Space, and Technology:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	143	149		0	0
Veterans Affairs:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	1,691	1,571		894	15,969
Ways and Means:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	447,378	443,377		2	0
Unassigned:					
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	-230,692	-225,599		0	0
Grand total	1,187,800	1,155,800	0	18,355	109,767

Note.—Figures may not add due to rounding.

Abbreviations: BA=new budget authority; Out=outlays; NEA=new entitlement authority; DL=new direct loan obligations; and LG=new loan guarantee commitments.

GROUND TRANSPORTATION CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day weekend traditionally marks the beginning of summer. For many Americans, summer vacation means travel to tourist meccas all across the country. Today is the perfect opportunity to discuss a problem that will affect many tourist families when they arrive at unfamiliar airports and seek to rent a car for their vacation.

A growing number of airports charge access fees to off-airport service providers, such as car rental firms and other concessionaires. Fees that are assessed on the basis of gross receipts rather than airport use place a burden on consumers and pose a threat to competition. The Consumer Federation of America estimated that the indirect impact of these fees could be as great as \$500 million annually and noted that the most direct burden falls on those least able to afford the fee—tourists.

That is why I am reintroducing the Ground Transportation Consumer Protection Act, that I introduced with our former colleague from California, Mr. Bosco last year.

Airports should be permitted to assess reasonable fees to help defray the operating costs and exert reasonable control over traffic and commerce on airport grounds. However, some airports are engaging in arbitrary and discriminatory practices. Gross revenue fees of up to 10 percent imposed simply for driving on airport roads to pick up and discharge prereserved customers bear no relationship to either actual costs incurred by the airports or the benefits received by the service providers. Yet, airports continue to attempt to use their power to force off-airport services to either pay the fees or else refuse them the right to drive on the airport roads.

The Ground Transportation Consumer Protection Act will allow airports to charge access fees that are fair and reasonable. But, the bill also would prohibit access fees that would lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In addition, the bill would require airports to provide information on the location of airport ground transportation services and protect the consumer's right of access to all courtesy vehicles.

This bill will bring fairness into the airport service fee system. It will also help ensure a competitive business environment, thereby benefiting the consumer. Unreasonable access fees that give on-airport businesses an unfair advantage reduce competition and hurt the businessperson and vacationer. This bill will help protect these travelers.

Perhaps the most interesting letter of support came last year from Mr. Gary L. Paxton, senior vice president Operations & Properties, Dollar Rent A Car in Los Angeles. Even though Dollar is onsite in over 120 airports, Dollar opposed gross receipts fees "because they threaten the free market competitive atmosphere that has enabled [his] company to flourish."

Mr. Paxton noted that on-airport companies enjoy the advantage of greater access to the traveling public, counters, and close-in vehicle access. By contrast, the off-airport companies use the airport public roadway system. Under these circumstances, he wrote:

It is not fair, and it would stifle competition, for the airports, under pressure from companies like Hertz, to continue to limit the number of companies which can operate on-airport while at the same time imposing fees on off-airport companies substantially equivalent to the fees imposed on the on-airport companies.

Mr. Paxton then gets to the crux of the issue:

The antitrust-immune airports should not be permitted to do for Hertz, what Hertz was forbidden from doing with Avis and National 14 years ago: namely, create a monopoly.

Finally, he states that—

[t]he Federal government has the responsibility to build and maintain the best air traffic system in the world and to promote and protect an environment where competition flourishes and the interests of the traveling public are protected.

An Alabama franchisee made several interesting points in his letter.

This concept of the Airport Authority having the right to impose taxes in an unreasonable and unfair manner on the customers who happen to be coming to the community through the airport terminal is a dangerous concept. This illogic, if extended, could require hotels to pay 10% of every room charge on customers they pick up at the airport; or an attorney to pay 10% of the fee of a client he picks up at the airport; or an engineering firm to pay 10% of the engineering charges to a client he picks up at the airport. . . .

It is very important to impress on the Airport Authority that the customers coming through the airport terminal are not coming to see the terminal. The[y] are coming for all the business, cultural, and recreational attractions of the community. The Airport Authority does not own them and should not be permitted to impose these unreasonable and unfair fees on the traveling public.

It is worth noting that all of the businessmen who wrote to me expressed support for fair and reasonable fees for running courtesy vehicles on airport roads. That is exactly what my legislation permits. The bill is procompetition and proconsumer. It deserves the support of the House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my colleagues' attention to Jonathan Rauch's article in the New Republic of April 22, on this very subject. For the benefit of my colleagues, the article follows:

[From the New Republic, Apr. 22, 1991]
TAKING DRIVERS FOR A RIDE. STOP IT HERTZ
(By Jonathan Rauch)

The next time you go to the airport, you'll notice that there are four or five rent-a-car concessions right there in the lobby. Want a

car? Just walk up to the counter, sign the papers, and drive away. Of course, the convenience will cost you. Typically the rent-a-car company pays the airport 10 percent of its gross receipts. That cost—a dime of every dollar you pay—is passed along to you. Fair is fair. That's the American way.

The American way, that is, of the late nineteenth century, when the great cartels and company towns still flourished. For a case study in modern American feudalism, look a little further.

Suppose you're on a budget. You're willing to sacrifice convenience, so you rent a car from a company with offices outside the airport. "Off-airport," they're called in the business, and in the 1980s, they sprang up by the dozen. They pick you up at the curb and shuttle you to the rental lot some distance away. A hassle, but you save money. Meanwhile, the guys in the airport lobby lose a customer—and the airport loses its 10 percent commission.

So what have many airports—which are public monopolies, and thus exempt from antitrust actions—begun doing in the last few years? They have imposed a fee on off-airport companies for the privilege (as they call it) of driving vans in front of the airport to pick up customers. This required commission typically runs to something like 8 percent of gross receipts.

Yes, you've got it. Ten percent (and often a rent payment, but consumer advocates say the charge is usually well below market rates) buys a company a concession right there in the airport. Eight percent buys the privilege of meeting your customers with a van.

Airport managers defend the policies on the grounds that companies that depend on the airport for business should "pay their fair share" to support it. Airports, after all, are expensive to run. Walter Burg, the general manager of Tucson's airport, says, "People who make their living off the airport ought to pay for it."

By this logic presumably, luggage companies, which also make their living off the airport, should be required to pay a percentage of their gross in exchange for the privilege of access to airport baggage stands. Airports don't go that far. But some of them do take their commission even for off-airports rental-car customers who never use the van. These airports charge the access fee against any customer who rents his car within, say forty-eight hours of arriving at the airport. Don't like it? Off-airport companies who don't agree to this arrangement can kindly keep their shuttle buses off airport property.

If you think an 8 percent fee makes no difference, ask Jim Cantwell. He owned a Thrifty rental franchise in Tucson—indeed, had invested most of his savings in it. Since he was off-airport, he ran a five-passenger limo to meet each flight. Two years ago the airport switched from charging him about \$1,400 a year for that privilege to charging him 7.5 percent of his gross receipts—about \$40,000 a year, he says. The reason was that rental companies with offices in the lobby were saying they'd have to take a hike if something wasn't done about their off-airport competitors. Whether Cantwell could make money in Arizona's slow economy was iffy to begin with; the fee, he says, made survival impossible. He left the rental-car business and narrowly averted personal bankruptcy.

Everyone agrees that off-airport rental companies should pay some portion of what it costs to run airports. The question is how much. In justifying their pricing policies,

the airports offer at least a dozen rationales, most of them unimpressive. The main reason, however, is not hard to find in testimony from Senate hearings last year: "If airports are prohibited from or restricted in charging fees to off-airport car rental companies, on-airport car rental companies will have a tremendous incentive to move off airport and, in the process, take with them the substantial revenues they generate."

So at last we reach the center of this thicket. Long ago, when rental car companies were few and they all had counters in air terminals, airports set a more or less arbitrary 10 percent gross-receipts fee. All companies were equally affected so none objected. Markets then did what they always do to cozy arrangements, which was to create alternatives. Off-airport companies sprang up. The airports now had only two choices. They could lower their own charge, from 10 percent to whatever the market would bear. Or they could force the competition's prices up. A private company in a competitive market would have had to do the former. Airports, being monopolies, could do the latter. And so they did.

Not surprisingly, the enraged competitors have come to Washington for a solution—one that is little better than the problem. They want to bring the airports' pricing policies under the jurisdiction of the courts or the regulators. (Right now these policies are off-limits to both.) The airports and rent-a-car giants that oppose the legislation, and that have prevailed so far, argue that it's unwise to get Congress and the courts mired in the business of setting rental-car concession fees. And they're right. What do judges and politicians know about how much rental-car concessions should cost? You'd have to pass a bill or go to court or petition a bureaucracy every time you wanted to change a price.

A better solution would be for airports to recognize market realities and put the whole supply of rental-car counters and pickup-van permits out for bid. If they still needed revenues, they could assess charges based on passengers' and companies' actual use of airport property.

But it would be best of all to avoid this kind of problem in the first place: in other words, to look for alternatives to public monopolies. What this whole snakebitten mess illustrates is that public monopolies—whether they're running airports, delivering the mail, teaching inner-city schoolchildren, or signing welfare checks—can be just as high-handed and backward as private ones. This is a fact that some Democrats are starting to catch on to. It's high time for more liberals to listen to Jim Cantwell's complaint and fall out of love with public monopolies.

IT IS TIME TO SETTLE A MATTER OF HIGHEST NATIONAL PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, we probably will not take the full 60 minutes tonight, but for some few minutes, several of us would like to talk about recent developments and hopes in the area of the ongoing POW/MIA problems and controversies.

Mr. Speaker, as many of us know from very recent press reports, yet another key player in the official effort

to resolve POW/MIA issues had leveled allegations that the bureaucracy has "a mindset to debunk" and is not serious about resolving this "highest national priority."

Army Col. Millard Peck resigned in protest from his position as Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency's (DIA) special office for POW's and MIA's. In leaving a scathing memo he echoed some of the concerns first raised in 1986 by retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Eugene Tighe, DIA Director from 1974 to 1981.

This latest incident in the attempt to resolve longstanding questions about those unaccounted for in Indochina is a too familiar tragedy of official inaction. I would not assert a grand conspiracy theory or worse. But I am more concerned that this matter of "highest national priority" be handled competently and energetically.

Colonel Peck accused the administration of using his DIA Office as "a toxic waste dump to bury the whole 'mess' out of sight and mind."

His resignation statement said:

That national leaders continue to address the prisoner of war and missing in action issue as the "highest national priority" is a travesty. From my vantage point, I observed that the principle Government players were interested in conducting a "damage limitation exercise," and appeared to knowingly and deliberately generate an endless succession of manufactured crises and "busy work." Progress consisted in frenetic activity, with little substance and no real results.

He further said:

The mindset to "debunk" is alive and well. It is held at all levels, and continues to pervade the POW/MIA Office, which is not necessarily the fault of DIA. Practically all analysis is directed to finding fault with the source. Rarely has there been any effective, active follow through on any of the sightings, nor is there a responsive "action arm" to routinely and aggressively pursue leads.

Tomorrow, Colonel Peck will be appearing before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee. I am hopeful his resignation and the allegations which he courageously raised in his memo will be fully examined in months to come.

Colonel Peck's memo carried references to the "mindset to debunk" which first became public in a summary released by retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Eugene Tighe, DIA Director from 1974 to 1981. While Lieutenant General Tighe and subsequent congressional and DOD investigations found no evidence of a coverup at DIA, the first response at the DIA to new live sighting reports is to presume the report is fabricated or to attack the source.

Some significant progress has occurred on POW/MIA issues in Indochina and Korea. I accompanied Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY on a congressional mission last year to receive seven sets of American remains from the North Koreans. These were the first sets of remains returned in decades.

At that time we proposed to the North Korean Government the establishment of a regular cooperative system to investigate POW/MIA matters from the Korean war and to repatriate remains of American servicemen there.

Although the North Koreans, for reasons known only to themselves, have now become less cooperative, an important precedent for cooperation of the issue has been established.

In Indochina, the work of Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., U.S. Army (retired), former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and special U.S. Presidential envoy to Vietnam for POW/MIA matters, has been invaluable. On April 19 and 20, 1991, the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam agreed in principle to establish a United States temporary technical liaison office in Hanoi to assist in United States-Vietnamese joint searches for the possible remains of Americans.

Subsequent to that announcement, the United States is offering a modest amount of humanitarian aid, for the first time since the end of the Vietnam war 16 years ago, in the form of prosthetics for Vietnamese citizens.

It would appear that the winds of glasnost have truly swept much of the Communist world, affecting even hard line states like Vietnam and North Korea, and making substantive work on resolution of POW/MIA issues a real possibility. There are dramatic opportunities for the United States to seek international cooperation to resolve lingering questions about POW/MIA's.

It is time too put aside business as usual attitudes and for the Administration and the Pentagon to aggressively and substantively pursue all live sighting reports.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my good friend.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for taking out this special order and for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the issue of the plight of those who over the past 15-plus years have been classified as missing in action/prisoners of war in Southeast Asia has been an extraordinarily frustrating one, most frustrating for the families, of course, and, of course, those courageous men who have been in that part of the world and are unaccounted for. But it also has been a very difficult time here in the Congress.

I think back on a number of our colleagues. We are here with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who has worked diligently for years on this issue.

My friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY], and I have traveled together, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], to Southeast Asia trying to bring about a full accounting of those classi-

fied as missing in action. I remember our former colleague, Bill Hendon, who to this day tries diligently to pursue this, and our colleague now serving in the other body, BOB SMITH, has worked hard on it, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], who is, as the gentleman from Indiana just said, holding a hearing tomorrow to discuss this, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and I could go through names of nearly every Member of this House.

We all have a great deal of concern, but it has been frustrating, because we have more often than not come up with very little evidence in the past several years, which has simply fueled the frustration.

I have to admit to being frustrated on this. I first got involved in this issue when a young woman, Sherry Masterson, whose father, Col. Bat Masterson, was shot down over Laos in 1968, looked to me and said, "Please, tell me that my father is dead."

□ 1950

The reason she said that, of course, is that she is living daily with the uncertainty as to whether or not her father is dead or alive. We continue to have reports of live sightings, and there have been several developments that have taken place within the last several weeks and months.

Of course, in February, the memorandum to which my friend from Indiana referred that came from Millard Peck upon his resignation, charging a lot, making many, many charges, which are very disconcerting.

I hope we are able, tomorrow, in the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee hearing to get some good answers to this tough question that has been posed.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Reclaiming my time, would the gentleman say that it is important that the attitude in that subcommittee, though, be one of openness for discussion, rather than anyone going in with any preconceptions?

I am sure the gentleman is aware of what I am alluding to.

Mr. DREIER of California. If my friend would continue to yield, the gentleman from Indiana said to me just about 45 minutes ago, that he is concerned that there might not be a great deal of openness in that subcommittee. I hope very much that there is openness and that there is a great interest, and I am not a member.

The gentleman from Indiana is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He will be there. I am looking forward to visiting as a guest of the subcommittee tomorrow. I do believe that there will be an openness and willingness to listen to a report that Colonel Peck would be providing about his findings. Colonel Peck served for a long period of time as the head of the inves-

tigative wing of the Defense Intelligence Agency charged with bringing about a resolution of the POW/MIA crisis.

There have been some other developments, of course, there that have taken place within the past few weeks on this issue. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has come out with a letter in which they said that, despite public pronouncements to the contrary, the real internal policy of the U.S. Government was to act upon the presumption that all MIA's were dead. That was something that we have again discussed many times.

We want to assume that there possibly are people that are still alive, rather than going at this issue with the presumption that they are dead. We have many, many very difficult challenges ahead, but I believe that the United States of America has to continue its resolve, because as of last week, 2,273 people are still classified as missing in action in Southeast Asia. What kind of signal does this send if we do not pursue this question?

This is Memorial Day week. I am sure by friend from Indiana, my friend from New York, and my friend from San Diego and other colleagues here spent time on Monday speaking. I spoke to three different memorial services held in Pomon, Glendora, and Whittier, CA. At every one of those meetings, the issue of the plight of those missing in action was discussed. I think that it, once again, underscores the necessity for Members to redouble our efforts to ensure that we bring about a full accounting of those who are missing in action.

I thank my colleagues for taking out this special order. I know we have many brave new courageous people who have been prisoners of war, including a gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] who just joined this body, and was as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] who introduced him, held for 4 years in solitary confinement, longer than any other person.

I think this is an issue that will be continued to be debated here in Congress. I congratulate my friend from Indiana for the leadership he has offered in this.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for all his dedication, all his efforts, and particularly for appearing tonight to state his concerns.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] for reserving this time to discuss this important topic.

As a member of the House Select Committee on our POW's and MIA's back in the mid-1970's, chaired by SONNY MONTGOMERY, as an original member of the subsequent House task

force on this issue, and as former—1983–85—chairman and current vice chairman on the House task force, I welcome any opportunity to air the complexities of the POW/MIA issue. It is important that we in Congress maintain our leadership in and pursuit of our POW/MIA problem, and that we continue to give a full accounting and to educate the American people regarding the fates of the nearly 2,300 Americans still unaccounted for. Most important, it is essential that we never let the Communist governments in Hanoi, Cambodia, and Laos forget that we Americans are united on our desire for a full accounting, and that we will not rest until it is obtained.

Mr. Speaker, our friends in Hanoi may wish to sweep our POW's and MIA's under the rug, but we will never allow this to happen.

Along with many of my colleagues I was gravely disturbed by the recent press reports of Col. Millard A. Peck's sudden resignation as head of the Defense Intelligence Agency [DIA] Special Office for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action after only 8 months on the job. I was concerned about the allegations Colonel Peck made at the time of his departure in his memo marked "no distribution" but which in fact most of us in this Chamber—if not most of official Washington—has seen, if not in its original form, certainly in the synopses made widely available to the press.

I believe the allegations made by Colonel Peck should certainly be looked into. I applaud the announcement by Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney that he is authorizing an internal Department of Defense investigation into Colonel Peck's allegations.

However, we in the Congress cannot ignore Colonel Peck's behavior in not coming before the appropriate bodies in Congress—namely, our House Task Force on POW's and MIA's—with his allegations before making them public and before his melodramatic departure from DIA.

Many of us in the Congress question Colonel Peck's attack on every branch of Government involved with the POW/MIA issue, including Vietnam veterans, without presenting substantiating evidence. His accusations question the integrity of those who have dedicated their lives to an accounting of 2,276 missing American heroes.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time for a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], I am not sure if I did get the full version of Colonel Peck's statement, but in all candor, just for the basic integrity of our discussion, I am not aware that he impugned the integrity of thousands of people working on that issue, particularly.

I think he was especially thankful and solicitous of the concerns and the efforts and the ongoing dedication of

his coworkers at the DIA. He did express concerns as to the motivations of others. However, in all candor, I do not think he gave a blanket indictment of everyone working or of Vietnam veterans.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, in response to the gentleman, while he did say he was thankful for the coworkers' attempt at resolving the issue, he impugned that there had been a coverup and that there had been neglect and negligence.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I think that is true.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, without pinpointing where that came from, and that left a color of laxity and color of not fulfilling the responsibility in this office.

As vice chairman of the House Task Force on POW's and MIA's, I joined with our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] in inviting Colonel Peck to come before our panel to present the evidence substantiating his allegations which led to his decision to abandon his post.

Although it has been stated by many who are active on this issue that seven previous independent investigations have been conducted into conspiracy charges, each concluding that no cover-up on the POW/MIA issue exists, I see no reason why an eighth investigation should not take place.

□ 2000

If Colonel Peck has additional information which has not been considered in the past, by all means we owe it to the American people and to our missing Americans to give it a full and fair hearing.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to note the statement issued on May 20 by the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, the leading organization representing the families of those who are still missing:

We know that the POW/MIA issue is complex, demanding and emotional; however, Col. Peck's expressions of frustration, after only eight months, are misdirected—he should have focused on those who hold the answers, primarily in Hanoi. Knowing this reality, the League will continue to focus on Hanoi, while advocating and expecting intensified, professional and thorough efforts by all agencies of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been immersed in the POW/MIA issue for many years are well aware of the reversal of the apathetic policy administrations prior to the early 1980's. We are fully aware that President Ronald Reagan, followed by President George Bush, have both placed the highest priority on this concern.

Rather than fighting among ourselves, arguing that too little is being done too late, we should be gratified that our Government is indeed pursuing the issue on every avenue available.

As we consider this frustrating, complex issue, let us focus on recent progress made on the issue, especially on the opening of a temporary United States office in Hanoi to investigate live-sighting reports, gaining access to historical information on individual cases from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam archives, to plan joint United States-Socialist Republic of Vietnam operations, and to facilitate forensic review and prompt repatriation of remains.

We are also gratified that we are beginning to make some progress with the government of Laos in excavating crash sites.

Mr. Speaker, let us give a full hearing to what Colonel Peck has to say and to learn what his views are regarding the handling of this important issue. At the same time, let us bear in mind that our administration is certainly seeking a full and final accounting of our missing-in-action and that the Bush administration has been devoting its time, energy, and resources to fully resolving this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and I thank him for arranging this time tonight.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I really do appreciate the gentleman appearing here tonight and participating in this part of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, yielding to me and the time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has taken, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. Speaker, I have not just been involved with the POW/MIA issue, but I have been immersed in it. I have worn a POW/MIA bracelet since 1969. I have had what you might call extreme emotion, anger, and frustration over the events that have taken place since the 1960's and the lack of attention that has taken place up to this date.

I was shot down myself on the 10th of May, 1972. I just celebrated the anniversary of that date.

We have two POW's that were listed as MIA's at one time on the House floor, one on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PETE PETERSON, who is a close friend, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, who is our newest Representative from Texas.

I want to tell you, whether the MIA's had survived or not is immaterial. The same day that I was shot down on the 10th of May over Hanoi, I had a good friend, Commander Blackburn from VF92 who was shot down. Steve Rudlof, his back seater, came back with the rest of the POW's in 1973–74.

Commander Blackburn's son works in Poway, not my district, but it is in the area. His son used to call me about once every 6 weeks, once every couple months and say, "Duke, can I talk about my Dad?"

The same questions, Mr. Speaker, the same answers.

About a year-and-a-half ago, they brought Commander Blackburn's remains back. It was like a thousand-pound weight had been lifted off that boy's back. He did not want to see his father come back like that, but that resolve we owe. We owe that to the members of the families, the sons and the daughters.

It is not just the frustration, and whatever the hearings show up, no matter how many hearings we have had in the past, if there is one shred of evidence, one straw, and I do not care if it is a Democrat administration or a Republican administration or what it is, if there is some negligence, then I think extreme penalties should be in place, because this is an issue that affects the American public, the American people, the families and the members themselves.

I would hope that we do have some servicemen alive. I am looking forward to the answers.

I do not know what Colonel Peck's motivations were, but I am anxious to find out, as I am sure my colleague from Indiana is. I laud the gentleman for calling this special order, but again I would listen to the debate and the meetings with open mind; but if they give us the same rhetoric as they have since the 1960's, that is the time when we should put our foot down and knock down a few doors to demand that the answers and the results of those answers be carried out.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I think no one will say, not everyone is going in with an open mind tomorrow, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I hope we all do truly go with an open mind.

I regret that I have not had the opportunity to get to know Colonel Peck better. We just spent about half an hour together 6 or 8 months ago one day talking about various matters; but I respect his bearing, his sense of commitment. I understand he is a decorated combat veteran of Vietnam. I think he is a person we have to assume to be of the highest integrity. I think people can often make mistakes or have differences of opinion or judgment without being misdirected.

I will say quite candidly that over the years, in the 6 or 8 years that I have been working on this, I have seen people, and I do not want to get into names, but I could in the particular POW National Security apparatus lead-

ership committee that he is talking about actively try in effect to slander and undermine the sincere efforts of various Members of the Congress of both parties who were working on this issue. I think that is unfortunate, because my feeling is that all of us have approached this with sincerity, integrity and good will.

I think we would be kidding each other if we did not recognize that it can get pretty vicious and pretty hostile out there, depending whether you agree or disagree with A or B in the administration on the POW/MIA issue. We have all seen this and we have worked together, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and we have talked about this before. I can name names on that and bring back the telex's, the telegrams, and the phone messages that were undermining the various efforts that we were making in Southeast Asia at the time, in all sincerity.

Again, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has been a leader on this. I know the gentleman's integrity and his commitment and I know the gentleman is going in there tomorrow with an open mind and will continue to work on this with an open mind.

I also think it is true that we all have enough experience in this to know that the process has not been perfect. There are real problems. It is true that going over those various live siting reports, there are problems and various things that have not been done that any basically analytic intelligent person, not necessarily having any expertise, would have followed up on that were not followed up on. We have seen that.

Again, we have Colonel Peck with his statements and General Thai who ran the DIA, and who I guess after he left the DIA, and that is one of the problems in all this, points not to a conspiracy, not to anyone's lack of integrity or a desire to undermine or not adhere to the highest patriotic and compassionate ideals; but General Thai was the first to utter that ringing phrase which has really struck home in my mentality, and that is the mind-set to debunk. It seems that everyone who raises this issue, who thinks there may be something out there, automatically has to be immediately impugned, quite frankly, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] at the highest levels of the DIA.

So I would say in some ways it ought to settle down. We ought to have an open mind and continue to work on this.

But I for one do not think it will be a problem, but I want to hear Colonel Peck out tomorrow and assume he has done the best he can. I just know that given his experience and his dedication, he is going to give us some information on all this that will be helpful.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield further?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think the point being that if there is some evidence that there was neglect, willful neglect on any Member, not only in the House but any branch of the Government, Presidential or all the way down to the lowest level, there should be no reason why if we know of the existence of MIA's that we should not go in and try to get them.

□ 1010

There is no politics high enough to stop that endeavor. And if that was the case, then I think we should seriously look into that, not that we go out with blind allegations, but if there is proof of that neglect, then I for one would be one who would go for the throat.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN].

WHY CONSERVATIVES DON'T TALK ABOUT AMERICA'S HEALTH SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about health care, and I do this having the privilege of chairing the Democratic Study Group, which on Friday issued this report: "Why Conservatives Don't Talk About America's Health System. Laissez-Faire Medicine is Leading American Families and the Nation's Economy to Ruin."

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a compilation of data here that is very, very important because what it does is lay out some of the implications of not dealing with the health care crisis in this country.

Quite candidly, I am not going to make this appeal based upon the normal appeal that we should be making, compassion, charity for others, feeling that there is in my mind a constitutional right to adequate health care. I am not going to make my appeal on those grounds. I am going to make it on the basis of the necessity for this country to do something about health care or we will find that in every other area of its economy it is infected with a deep, deep illness that it is going to have a harder and harder time to shake.

I do that, incidentally, having started this morning during the 1-minute portion, started what will become a weekly tradition in which I am going to introduce to this Congress every week a person, a West Virginian, a constituent who is having problems getting adequate access to health care. Many of these people you are going to

find having among them a common attribute which is they work or a member of their family works, but that the problem of inadequate access to health care is growing rapidly in our society. So much so that the numbers of uninsured or underinsured is rapidly growing.

My purpose for doing this is I happen to think there are far too many statistics floating around out there that make the case, but somehow we have been numbed by them. We have been numbed by the 37 million uninsured. We have heard that figure so much now that people figure, well, 37 million, that is so big that it boggles the mind, "I can't deal with it."

Or perhaps we have been numbed by the 60 million to 70 million that are underinsured. Yes, they have insurance, but it is not adequate for their needs.

Or we have been numbed by many of the other statistics.

So, in order to get it beyond the black-and-white statistics such as are in this report, I will be introducing once a week to the Congress somebody who is not a statistic but is a real tragedy, and the problems they are having.

But tonight let us deal with statistics because I think that also helps to make the case.

First of all, I think it is important to note where the problem begins. The problem begins on the Reagan administration watch because the problem starts there. Yes, there has been a health care problem in this country for a number of years. You can trace it back to the 1940's, following World War II, when there began to be rising increases in health care. But if you look from 1950 to 1980, you will see the rise in health care costs has been incremental, somewhat over regular inflation, about 1.2 percent over per year on the average, but still within the capacity of America's working families to deal with; hard at times, but to deal with.

That is up until 1980. In 1980, they just take off through the roof. In 1980 to 1990, health care costs doubled in their rate of increase until they are almost double the rate of regular inflation.

So, today you can see part of the result in per capita health spending on this chart. That comes from the OECD health data bank in which the United States, the pink line the per capita health spending is \$2,354, the next largest amount per capita expenditure is \$1,683, Canada, Sweden, \$1,361. United Kingdom that we hear so much about in an adverse way so often about their health care system, \$836.

So the United States per capita spends far more than any other country. I might add we also spend more as a percentage of our gross national product.

Last year we spent roughly 12 percent of our gross national product in

health care, and it is rising, it is the fastest growing part of our economy, health care; paying more and getting less, fastest growing part of our economy.

The next leading nation is Canada or perhaps Sweden at roughly 8.6 percent of their gross national product. So you can see that rapidly rising health care costs affect per capita and also our GNP, and they affect what portion of our resources are going to health care.

But make no mistake about it, this occurred during the last decade.

There are other statistics, I think, that bear that out. If you look at what the American working family spends, how long they have to work in order to pay their health care bill, you will see that it remains roughly constant from 1965 to 1980. These are the green lines, 1965, 1970, 1975, 1980, it is roughly 3.3 weeks of their gross earnings went to pay for health care during that 15-year period. That is 3.3 weeks of their gross earnings.

Now look what happens starting in the decade beginning with the 1980's. Up to over 4 weeks from 1980 to 1985; from 1985 to 1989, 4.8 weeks, and going up, up, up, for failure to address the problem.

People talk about hidden taxes; here is a hidden tax given to you courtesy of those who do not think that the Government ought to be doing anything about health care. That is a fact that more and more of the working families' income goes to pay for health care. And that is their gross earnings, I might add.

Now, what happens to health care costs in the same period? Let us go back: Here you see the earnings per worker, that is the purple line, earnings per worker at the average wage. What is happening, and you do not need to tell working families this, what is happening is that their wages in inflation-adjusted dollars are going down. From 1980 to 1990, average wage in this country, the average hourly wage went from something like \$10.56 an hour to roughly \$10.03, a few pennies here or there. But the point is it was on a downward track. And that is an inflation-adjusted dollar over that decade period.

That is reflected in this line; workers' wages going down. Look what is happening to workers' health care costs; going up. This period starts in 1970 over on this side of the chart, here is 1975, 1980; now you begin to see the projections as it starts up for what it is going to be until if you project this on out, if the trends continue, which is working families; wages in inflation-adjusted dollars going down and health care costs going up at the same rate, what happens, incredibly, is somewhere around the year 2025 the American worker is paying 100 percent of their earnings for health care. Indeed, it goes over after that.

You tell me there is not a hidden tax for inaction, failure to act, failure to do something? If you went to a physician with these kinds of vital signs and the doctor did not take any action, you would sue for malpractice.

So that is one of the main reasons that the Congress, the administration must act. Yet, we have Dr. Sullivan, for whom I have a lot of respect in many areas, but yet is carrying out the policy of this administration, saying that this administration does not intend to offer any kind of significant health care legislation that guarantees adequate access to health care for everyone.

All of this is in this report, "Why Conservatives Don't Talk About America's Health System." Because what you see, quickly, is a system that is out of control and now is infecting far more than its own areas, far more than just health care costs.

Now let us look at another graph, the graph that I think is important, showing what is happening not only to American working families but to their ability to compete and to American industries; ability to compete; because let us make no mistake about it, American industry, business, is paying a very, very large share of health care costs and they are seeing their portion go up. In fact, a recent study suggests that American industry, American business is seeing their costs go up annually somewhere between 9 and 15 percent.

□ 2020

Take the low average, 9 percent, 9 percent a year increase in health care costs. For many of our businesses, particularly our small business, that is the faster growing part of their business costs, not wages, not training, not other areas. Health care costs. Small wonder then that it is within the small business community that one finds over 50 percent of the uninsured workers.

Why? Because the employers have no choice. The employers are faced with a draconian decision of whether to be able to continue operating in business, or cutting health care benefits or eliminating benefits, but what this report shows us, the Democratic Study Group report, is I think an incredible trend, which is that health care costs are now dragging down the rest of our economy and particularly our ability to compete, not only amongst ourselves, but abroad.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that health care costs are making U.S. goods more expensive so that the rising health care costs are wiping out the gains that we are making in other areas.

Let me give my colleagues some examples. Take productivity. I say, "You make all the productivity gains you want, and that's one of the things that

we fight and strive for in this country; that, as we recognize that there are lower wage bases and lower wage scales in other nations, the only way we can gain is through equality and through improving productivity. It is the only way we can compete. If you make productivity gains of 3 percent, if you have a 9 percent increase in health care costs, then all those productivity gains are wiped out."

Mr. Speaker, what this report suggests is that this Congress, this Government, can greatly revamp its educational system and improve it, can improve worker training, can make ourselves more competitive in so many ways, can increase productivity beyond what its average is, can make all of these great gains and strides, and we are still going to be running behind.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this chart illustrates here. I say, "If you take two workers in 1990, an American and a European, and both are making—we will start them at \$12 an hour, a little over \$12 an hour, and you figure that the American's health care costs—we'll give the benefit of the doubt—are going up on the low side, the 9 percent figure that I mentioned, not the 15 percent, the 9 percent figure, the European on the average health care costs will go up 4 percent. Let's assume the productivity is constant for both of them and increase roughly 2 percent a year in the manufacturing sector. What will happen in 1990 and 1991? The American worker is going to be able to produce the same product at slightly lower cost than the European worker."

Mr. Speaker, that is in 1990, but look what happens. That is reflected in the green line at the very end of the chart. That is the European worker in comparison to the American. But now look what happens as we go each year and we see the increase in health care costs being 9 percent to the American employer and 4 percent to the European employer and productivity gain roughly the same, at 2 percent, and what we will soon see happen is that the European worker becomes much more competitive in relation, and the cost of making the European product is much more competitive in relation to the American product, so much so that by the end of the decade, the year 2000 right in here, the American worker is going to have to make a tough decision, whether to give back \$1.30 in wages to reflect the difference in health care costs or to sell the product at a much cheaper cost, but in that case I ask, "How do you recover your costs? How do you stay in business? Or do you shut the plant?" That is the decision.

What happens is the cost of the American-made product, because of health care costs, goes up here while the cost to the European producer goes down here, and look at the widening gap. This is carried out to the year

2005, but even in the next decade look at the widening gap. So, whereas they started equal, and the American worker was actually slightly more productive when they made the same gains, and they worked the same job and made the same product, the one factor that was different was health care costs. The American worker fell behind, the American business fell behind, and so the message once again is quite clear. The message is that the failure to address the health care crisis in this country is not just a health care problem. It is an economic problem that infects our entire economic system.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a State that had 10 rural hospitals closed in the last 5 years. Talk about limiting access to care. It has had five primary care clinics in a small State closed in the last 5 years because of failure of cash-flow, and so we know first hand the problems in the health care system.

Mr. Speaker, this is a nation that has 37 million roughly. Some say 32. It is going to be up to 37 shortly the way things are going. A million uninsured, another 60 million underinsured. So, failure to address this means a failure to take on the basic problems affecting our economy.

There is another reason that people ought to be concerned. This is a tax increase. I do not care what it is called. People say, "How are you going to pay for any kind of health care changes? You know, it will be more expensive."

Well, my colleagues, I would say to the American worker, working family, that they know they are paying an increase now, and they are getting nothing for it. They are getting nothing for it; 3.3 weeks, 15 years ago, gross earnings to pay for your health care costs, up to 4.8 weeks, rising sharply, and today less people are covered in this country. They get less coverage, and the people that are paying pay more.

Now that is a heck of a deal. That is a hidden tax increase, and what is worse is that they are not even getting anything for it.

Some people would argue the proposal suggested, whether it is the Pepper Commission, whatever it is, that they have a built-in cost increase. Well, this report also says that there are some areas we can look at. We can look at, for instance, administrative costs. We can look at trying to unify the way that insurance companies require reporting. We can look at a lot of areas.

For instance, the United States has administrative costs as 24 percent of their health care. Canada is less than half of that in a recent study in the New England Journal of Medicine, and so there are other areas we can look at for cutting, but I am going to make a prediction here. I am going to make a prediction that, if we fail to do anything, if this administration fails to

come forward with a significant health care proposal which reassures everybody, says, "Listen, we didn't raise your taxes. You haven't seen a tax increase from us to pay for health care," let me tell my colleagues what is going to happen.

This tells us what is going to happen. Our costs are going up anyway. I say, "If you're a small business person or any employer, you're going to see your costs go up 9 percent next year."

Is that not an increase? Maybe not a tax increase to the Federal Government, but I say to my colleagues, "You're going to be paying more, and I'm going to make a prediction. You're not only going to pay more, but, if you're an employer, you're going to have to weigh very carefully whether or not you're going to cut benefits. You're going to have to make a decision about whether to require higher co-payment from your employees, a higher deductible, less utilization, more co-payment of the premium."

So, Mr. Speaker, lot of tough decisions.

So, somebody comes by and says, "Well, we haven't charged you any more." They are charging 9 percent more a year.

I know that in the insurance policy that my wife and I have, we have seen that premium go up 10 percent a year. Somebody going to tell me there has not been an increase?

The irony to the Pepper Commission report, which they agreed basically on the technique, but not on the funding mechanism, is that it predicted over a 5-year period to cover both long-term health care, as well as medical care, that it would be a \$66 billion annual increase after a 5-year period, and people said, "Whoa, not us. Sixty-six billion dollars; who's going to pay for that?"

We paid last year in this country \$690 billion. It is, as I mentioned, 12 percent of our gross national product. The Pepper Commission's recommendations were 10 percent of what our total health care bill last year was.

So, anybody in this Chamber or anywhere think that their bills are not going up, their health care bills are not going up by 10 percent next year? Of course my colleagues know that it is going up that much, and so in the year since that recommendation was made, in which the Congress could have acted, in the year since that was made health care costs have already gone up that amount and will go up that amount next year, and the situation is even worse.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the compelling reasons I feel for the need for Congress and the administration to address this. Other competitive costs, for instance, the health care cost today conservatively costs every American car manufacturer \$700 per vehicle. If

one is trying to be competitive, increasing productivity, doing all one can but it costs \$700 more to make a car because of health care costs when the next greatest competitor, the nation of Japan, is \$246 per car, France is \$375 and Germany is \$337, when the main competitor, which is the Japanese, are spending \$246 per vehicle and we are spending \$700 per vehicle, then we have got something like a \$450 edge to make up. That is a pretty tough ground to cover, to make up.

Let us say you are a taxpayer and you say, "What is happening to me there?" In 1980, for instance, health programs in this country consumed 17 percent of our federal domestic budget. Seventeen percent. Today they consume 22 percent, and in another five years it is estimated that they will consume 31 percent of our domestic budget, simply trying to meet the unaddressed health needs.

The growing number of uninsured, we all know that that is rising quickly because we all see personal instances of that. Who are these families that are uninsured? Are they working or are they just malingerers out there? We should not take care of them.

No connection to employment, the study, and this comes from other data from the Pepper Commission, no connection to employment, about 25 percent; part-time workers and their dependents comprise 13 percent; full-time workers and their dependents comprise 62 percent. They are the men and women working in the fast food stores. They are the men and woman working behind the counters in your retail establishments. They are the men and women often holding down two, sometimes three jobs, trying to make it.

They are doing what our society demands they do, work. And their reward for this? They cannot afford basic health care for themselves or their children.

You might say, how do we compare then with other nations? That is also a section of this report. Let us go back again to a chart.

The first figure I think is significant, once again, it is what this Nation spends per capita which is \$2,354 in 1989, compared to the next largest nation, Canada. Of course health care costs, as I mentioned, are a much larger part of our gross national product. This report punctures some myths, because there are some myths about Americans and their utilization of the health care system dealt with in the Democratic Study Group report.

For instance, there are many who would say the reason that health care costs are this high for Americans is that Americans visit the doctor a lot more. I have heard that one several times. Unfortunately it is wrong.

Americans actually do not visit the doctor or are underutilizers compared to other nations. Japan, for instance,

averages 12, almost 13 visits per capita during a year's time. West Germany, 1.5. The United States of America is 5.3.

Some would argue that the average length of stay in the hospital is longer for Americans. Not so, according to the Democratic Study Group report, which derives its figures here from OECD health data. Not so in Sweden, where the average patient days per admission in a Swedish hospital is almost 21 days. In West Germany it is 17.5. The United States is far down the list at 9.8.

Do Americans use the hospital more? Do we tend to be admitted? We had more people going to the hospitals as a percent of our population, some would argue. Once again, they would be arguing false statistics because France leads at 21 percent of their population visiting the hospital in any given year. We are somewhere almost 15 percent.

So there are some myths punctured in this report that I think are very, very significant. There is a lot more in this report. It will not all be covered tonight. I do intend to take more time, and I would invite others to join me in the future in discussing this report because I think what it does is to put out a lot of data that can be the basis for policy decisions as well as a lot of healthy debate. I certainly hope that that debate will be taking place.

Some might say, okay, we have had health care systems and we are spending more than other nations, considerably more. It is a larger percentage of our gross national product, but at least, thank goodness, we lead the world in quality of health care and in many of the vital statistics.

Well, I hate to puncture that myth, too, but unfortunately we are paying more and getting less.

For instance, to those who might suggest that the United States leads the world, regrettably that is not the case. With the male life expectancy in the United States being 71.5 years, we trail Australia, Austria, Canada, by about two years, France, West Germany, Iceland, it pays to live in Iceland, that is 75 years, Japan. Remember, they spend a lot less per vehicle making cars for health care and yet live longer.

There is a lesson there on that, too, Sweden and Switzerland, all of those nations. Incidentally, the overall average of those nations coming from the World Health Organization, the overall average for male life expectancy is 72.7 years. The United States is below that average, 71.5 years.

The same figures are borne out in infant mortality, where the average infant deaths per 1,000 live births for the same listed nations that I just read is 7.5 years. I need to correct myself, it is 7.5 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in the nations I just read. Regrettably, the United States has an average of 10.1 infant deaths per 1,000 live births.

Once again, we cannot even point to better health care and better results as a justification for the amount that is being spent. I am not here pointing fingers tonight. My observation, particularly in the last few years, is that everyone is suffering from this. Nobody is happy with this system any more. Physicians know that they in many areas are not able to deliver care for what the government would reimburse them. They know the restraints placed upon them. Hospitals are facing an incredible cash flow. Employers know that this system, large and small employers know that this system is not working for them. Consumers, taxpayers, government, the health care providers, you name it, the system is broken.

Perhaps in another forum, we can discuss what should be done. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this report, the Democratic Study Group special report on why conservatives do not talk about America's health system. What the report does not say, but it screams from every page, as you draw conclusions, is this Nation must do something. President Bush and the administration do not have the luxury of hiding back in the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue saying, "Do not worry, stay the course, no tax increase, status quo." The status quo is a prescription for sheer folly. It is a prescription for economic illness that far exceeds the problem simply in the health care industry. I liken it to a hospital.

We will say that this is the hospital where the United States of America brings all of its problems. You bring education. You got a reward for education, you are going to work on it. The physicians have a prescription. You have a treatment plan. You bring competitiveness. You bring in the need to increase productivity.

You bring the drug problem. You bring the Federal budget and all of its problems. And so you want to work on each of those. You try to address them, perhaps specifically, and in isolation from the others.

Then one day in through the emergency room finally you wheel in health care, and I mean this is a comatose patient. You figure, well, OK, health care well we will try to deal with in isolation also. It is taken up to the ICU, the intensive care unit. We have a problem.

As soon as health care rolls in, we have now infected the whole hospital with an illness far worse than what any of the individual components had before. If we do not cure health care, we do not cure the rest, because health care is now the major contributing illness to all of the other problems that you brought in.

The economy cannot overcome that drag that health care and health care crisis is putting on it. We cannot overcome it. We cannot make any gains until we deal with health care.

So as I started this session, I said, I talked about saying, we will not deal with the question of compassion tonight. Whether or not this country should continue to be one of only two major industrial nations that does not provide some sort of adequate access to health care strategy for all of its citizens, the other nation, incidentally, is South Africa, and not a nation I enjoy keeping a lot of company with.

□ 2040

But we agreed to skip that question. Instead we are going to deal with the economics, the per capita health spending, what it is doing to American working families, what it is doing to America's businesses, what the health care crisis is doing to America's ability to compete at home and abroad, what it is doing to our overall economic structure, and, finally, what it is doing to our families in terms of a hidden tax increase.

I keep stressing that, because the next time somebody tells you, "Oh, no, I am against the Government being involved in health care," or actually trying to even formulate a national health care strategy in which you put everything on the table, you put the administrative costs, you put cost controls, you put malpractice reform, you put access to health care, you put the need for more primary care, you put the need for preventive medicine as opposed to dealing with a traumatic situation when it is developed into a full-blown crisis, you put all of that on the table.

The next time somebody looks you in the eye and says, "But don't you worry, I am not going to consider a Government strategy because you are going to be paying more," they have an answer to who pays it, look them back in the eye and say, "Hey, buddy, I am paying more now." If I am fortunate enough to still have health insurance, a declining number, I know what is happening to my premium. If I am a senior citizen on Medicare, you are not fooling me, because Congress just cut my benefits last year in order to keep the system solvent, but I know I have seen my level of benefits steadily cut to provide the health care, that minimal level of health care, necessary.

If I am working at a job that pays minimum wage or slightly above, I cannot afford health care anyhow, and I know what happens if I have to take my child to the physician. I know how expensive that is, and I know I am having to make basic decisions based upon that. Also I know, according to the chart that was in the Democratic Study Group Report, that it is going to take almost 5 weeks of gross earnings to pay for what just 10 years ago was 3.3 weeks of gross earnings.

So, if you are a taxpayer, you say I am seeing more and more of my tax dollar go to health care costs, not buy-

ing me more education, it does not buy me any more roads, it does not buy me any more defense. All it does is restrict the options available.

You cannot do much deficit cutting if the health care costs are going up, and Medicare and Medicaid and other health care programs combined total somewhere around \$180 billion last year. Do not tell me you are doing something for me by saying you are against embracing some sort of national health care strategy that guarantees adequate access to all. It is not even a case of you pay now or you pay later. We are paying now.

The failure to act, the failure to get off the dime, is I think one of the great fallacies that this Congress, and particularly the administration, embraces, that they are somehow doing people a favor, they are saving them from a hidden cost.

The cost is there. You and I know that our costs are going up 10 percent at least next year. If you could tell me that, first of all, you are going to make an effort to reduce administration costs, a significant amount, and I think you can definitely cut into that, they estimate some \$60 billion of administrative costs, if you could cut that by one-fourth, you would save \$15 billion, that would pay for an acute care program for all Americans. If you told me that you made efforts to reduce administrative costs, that you made efforts to look at other areas of cost, and you are telling me it is still going to go up, but it is going to be less than what my increase is going to be anyhow, that I am not going to be continuing to see my wages, my gross earnings, the amount necessary to pay for health care, that I am going to be able to take home a little bit more, if you are telling me you are going to have a rational health system in which people are covered and that all of us are covered, then I would say, bring it on and stop being timid about it.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of the Democratic Study Group Report to Secretary Sullivan, who is a physician, the Secretary of Health and Human Services. He can read vital signs, I think, with the best of them.

What this says is that the patient's vital signs are bad for the patient. What the patient is doing is worsening our economic vital signs to the point it is a crisis situation requiring definite acute and long-term care.

Finally, let me say it is essential to deal with this problem. Failure to deal with the rising health care cost issue is a prescription for Americans paying more and more to cover fewer people, to give less coverage, and, at the same time, to continue to undercut our economy and to drag it down in such a way that it will never be able to achieve its full potential.

So we are going to talk in other evening sessions about why there ought to be adequate access to health care for a myriad of reasons. But tonight, I do, Mr. Speaker, urge every Member to look at this report, to read it carefully, to look at the statistics and the data and some of the conclusions that can be drawn. Some of these conclusions have not been drawn before, but it does not take much to see it. And then we will discuss it much more. You will come to the conclusion that I do, which is that the health care crisis in this country is no longer just a health care crisis. It is an economic crisis which requires immediate attention.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. RAMSTAD (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, on May 30 and 31.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 60 minutes, on May 30.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 60 minutes, on June 4, 5, and 6.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. KENNELLY, for 5 minutes, on May 30.

Ms. PELOSI, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes each day, on June 4, 11, 18, and 25.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 60 minutes each day, on June 5, 12, 19, and 26.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on June 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 21.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes each day, on June 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS, immediately preceding Mr. WALKER, in title III of H.R. 2427 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RINALDO.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. GREEN of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. APPELEGATE.

Mr. KOLTER.

Mr. SWETT in two instances.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida in two instances.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. REED.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. HARRIS.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to designate June 15, 1991, as "Magna Carta Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that Tibet, including those areas incorporated into the Chinese provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan, Gansu, and Qinghai that have historically been a part of Tibet, is an occupied country under established principles of international law whose true representatives are the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government in exile as recognized by the Tibetan people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 30, 1991, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1363. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report entitled "Department of the Army Report on Cleanup of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1364. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6958(c) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that an enlisted nominee to the Naval Academy must have served at least 1 year as an enlisted member on the date of entrance to the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1365. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-26, "Advisory Neighborhood Commission Election Temporary Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1366. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-27, "Uniform Law on Notarial Acts Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1367. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-28, "Persian Gulf Housing Assistance Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1368. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-29, "District of Columbia Depository Act of 1977 Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code,

section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1369. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-30, "District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm Active Duty Pay Differential Amendment Act of 1991" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1370. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-31, "Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia Compensation Amendment Act of 1991" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1371. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-33, "Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act of 1985 Amendment Act of 1991" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1372. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-32, "Assault Weapon Manufacturing Strict Liability Act of 1990 Repealer Act of 1991" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1373. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-34, "Ban on Automated Telephone Dialing Systems for Commercial Solicitation Act of 1991" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1374. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Review of the D.C. One Fund Procedures and Guidelines," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1375. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department's annual report on the administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the period October 1, 1989 through September 30, 1990, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 942; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1376. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1377. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reauthorize the program for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part H of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1378. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to improve the delivery of services to hard-to-serve youth and adults, to establish the Youth Opportunities Unlimited Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1379. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-25), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1380. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmit-

ting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Coordination Council of North American Affairs for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-26), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1381. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Transmittal No. 8-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1382. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting the 23d 90-day report on the investigation into the death of Enrique Camarena, the investigations of the disappearance of U.S. citizens in the State of Jalisco, Mexico, and the general safety of U.S. tourists in Mexico, pursuant to Public Law 99-93, section 134(c) (99 Stat. 421); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1383. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1384. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the 1990 report on the Human Immuno-deficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome [HIV/AIDS] Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1385. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1386. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1387. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1388. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b), (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1389. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1390. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the annual report for fiscal year 1990 covering the Outer Continental Shelf [OCS] Natural Gas and Oil Leasing and Production Program, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1343; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1391. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of a proposed water reclamation project for the Eastern Municipal Water District, California Small Reclamation Projects Act Program, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 422d; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1392. A letter from the U.S. District Court, District Judge of Maryland, transmitting his view that hearings should be held on the

amendments to the sentencing guidelines submitted by the Sentencing Commission to the Congress on May 1, 1991, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(p); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1393. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c), (d) (Doc. No. 102-92); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1394. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting certification that the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is making significant strides toward complying with the obligations of the Helsinki accords; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for Presidential determination regarding drawdown of defense articles and services in Bangladesh, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1396. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Money Laundering Improvements Act of 1991"; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1397. A letter from the Secretaries of Commerce and State, transmitting the annual Foreign Allocation Report for 1989, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1821(f); jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1992 (Rept. 102-81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. HYDE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. GOSS):

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:
H.R. 2475. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse being constructed at 400 Cooper Street in Camden, NJ, as the "Mitchell H. Cohen U.S. Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BEILENSON:

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and related laws to provide for public financing of House of Representatives elections, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Energy and Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. PARKER):

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for discretion in the shifting of crop acreage bases between farms in the case of a natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for contributions to individual retirement accounts as it existed before the Tax Reform Act of 1986 and to allow penalty-free withdrawals from such accounts for catastrophic expenses for personal, custodial, and medical care of individuals requiring such care by reasons of illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL of Texas:

H.R. 2480. A bill relating to the valuation of stock received by certain employees in connection with the performance of services as employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBBARD:

H.R. 2481. A bill to establish the National Workplace Safety Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2482. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to improve certain health professions training programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase payments for direct graduate medical education costs of primary care residents in initial residing period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 2485. A bill to terminate the obligation of funds by the United States for the superconducting super collider project; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself and Mr. HENRY):

H.R. 2486. A bill to provide air transportation passengers access to and information concerning ground transportation services, to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit certain activities by local governments that operate airports, to prohibit airports from charging unreasonable and unjustly discriminatory access fees, and for other purposes; jointly,

to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the luxury tax on boats and to offset the revenue loss from that repeal by repealing recent changes in certain percentage depletion provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 2488. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Repository of International Physician Credentials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. KOST-MAYER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit coverage of alcoholism and drug dependency residential treatment services for pregnant women and certain family members under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. STOKES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOXER (for himself, Mr. MOODY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. UNSOELD, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the restriction of the free speech rights of Federal employees and Federal grantees under the first amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

148. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to American service personnel missing in action; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Christy Carl Hallien of Arlington, TX; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. GILCREST:

H.R. 2491. A bill to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. FISH.
H.R. 77: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 207: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 242: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. JONTZ, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 252: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 261: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DIXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 330: Mr. DYALLY and Mr. FOGLIETTA.
H.R. 328: Mr. ORTON.
H.R. 352: Mr. CLINGER.
H.R. 392: Mr. HOYER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FROST, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. YATES, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 441: Mr. ESPY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 446: Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
H.R. 447: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PEASE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PRICE.
H.R. 543: Mr. FISH.
H.R. 642: Mr. FASCELL and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 784: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. HENRY.
H.R. 786: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 799: Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 801: Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 802: Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 803: Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 845: Mr. GORDON and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 924: Mr. FISH and Mr. NAGLE.
H.R. 944: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GREEN of New York, and Mr. ECKART.
H.R. 961: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 978: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
H.R. 989: Mr. RIGGS.
H.R. 1003: Mr. SANTORUM.
H.R. 1048: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
H.R. 1081: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1124: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.
H.R. 1130: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COX of Illinois.
H.R. 1300: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 1310: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 1311: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1312: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1330: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1346: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 1425: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1454: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1468: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1472: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1473: Mr. MOODY, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 1504: Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1554: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1599: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. CARR.

H.R. 1601: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DICKS, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1635: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1691: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. YATES, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. LOWEY of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1703: Mr. YATES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPY, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1718: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 1733: Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 1751: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1753: Mr. MILLER of Ohio and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1779: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DYALLY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1794: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1860: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FISH, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. AUCCOIN.

H.R. 2008: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2029: Mr. TORRES, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 2049: Mr. JAMES, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 2065: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2083: Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2084: Mr. HORTON, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2095: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FOG-

LIETTA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 2143: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2145: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2152: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2170: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2222: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 2234: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2235: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2241: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 2258: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 2337: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2358: Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 2361: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 2389: Ms. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 72: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KENNELLY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr.

BROWDER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MCCREERY.

H.J. Res. 181: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. ASPIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. EARLY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. BROWN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 211: Mr. BROWN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BEVIL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MORRISON, Mr.

BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.J. Res. 215: Mr. MOODY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MFUME.

H.J. Res. 217: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.J. Res. 219: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. RAY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. PICKLE.

H.J. Res. 245: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. CONDIT.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 146: Mr. ROSE and Mr. GILCHREST.

H. Res. 96: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. JONTZ, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 134: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BUSH SUPPORTS CONGRESSIONAL ARMS CONTROL INITIATIVE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the "jump start" action—to replace the arms race with arms restraint in the Middle East taken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 23—has worked.

We now have the driver, that is, the President, back in the driver's seat.

We, in Congress, will support him and expect the same from other parts of the U.S. Government.

Just as the President has successfully led the United States and the international community in war against Iraq, Congress is urging him to lead the United States and the international community to bring lasting peace in the Middle East.

Congress has already acted to: control nuclear proliferation; strengthen the missile technology control regime; implement chemical weapons sanctions; and stop business as usual in the Middle East conventional arms race by legislating last week in committee a conventional arms restraint policy which would put in place an indefinite moratorium challenging other supplier nations to join us in a multilateral arms restraint regime.

I am including for the RECORD a fact sheet on President Bush's Middle East Arms Control Initiative and a May 23, 1991, release by the Committee on Foreign Affairs describing its action on a conventional arms restraint policy for the Middle East:

WHITE HOUSE FACT SHEET ON MIDDLE EAST ARMS CONTROL INITIATIVE

Fulfilling the pledge he made in his March 6 address to a joint session of Congress, the President announced today a series of proposals intended to curb the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons in the Middle East, as well as the missiles that can deliver them. The proposals also seek to restrain destabilizing conventional arms build-ups in the region.

The proposals would apply to the entire Middle East, including Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and other states of the Maghreb and the Gulf Cooperation Council. They reflect our consultations with allies, governments in the region, and key suppliers of arms and technology.

The support of both arms exporters and importers will be essential to the success of the initiative. Since proliferation is a global problem, it must find a global solution. At the same time, the current situation in the Middle East poses unique dangers and opportunities. Thus, the President's proposal will concentrate on the Middle East as its starting point, while complementing other initiatives such as those taken by Prime Ministers

John Major and Brian Mulroney. It includes the following elements.

SUPPLIER RESTRAINT

The initiative calls on the five major suppliers of conventional arms to meet at senior levels in the near future to discuss the establishment of guidelines for restraints on destabilizing transfers of conventional arms, as well as weapons of mass destruction and associated technology. France has agreed to host the initial meeting. (The United Kingdom, France, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States have supplied the vast majority of the conventional arms exported to the Middle East in the last decade.) At the same time, these guidelines will permit states in the region to acquire the conventional capabilities they legitimately need to deter and defend against military aggression.

These discussions will be expanded to include other suppliers in order to obtain the broadest possible cooperation. The London Summit of the G-7, to be hosted by the British in July, will provide an early opportunity to begin to engage other governments.

To implement this regime, the suppliers would commit

To observe a general code of responsible arms transfers;

To avoid destabilizing transfers; and

To establish effective domestic export controls on the end-use of arms or other items to be transferred.

The guidelines will include a mechanism for consultations among suppliers, who would

Notify one another in advance of certain arms sales;

Meet regularly to consult on arms transfers;

Consult on an ad hoc basis if a supplier believed guidelines were not being observed; and

Provide one another with an annual report on transfers.

MISSILES

The initiative proposes a freeze on the acquisition, production, and testing of surface-to-surface missiles by states in the region with a view to the ultimate elimination of such missiles from their arsenals.

Suppliers would also step up efforts to coordinate export licensing for equipment, technology and services that could be used to manufacture surface-to-surface missiles. Export licenses would be provided only for peaceful end uses.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The initiative builds on existing institutions and focuses on activities directly related to nuclear weapons capability. The initiative would

Call on regional states to implement a verifiable ban on the production and acquisition of weapons-usable nuclear material (enriched uranium or separated plutonium);

Reiterate our call on all states in the region that have not already done so to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

Reiterate our call to place all nuclear facilities in the region under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards; and

Continue to support the eventual creation of a regional nuclear weapon-free zone.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The proposal will build on the President's recent initiative to achieve early completion of the global Chemical Weapons Convention.

The initiative calls for all states in the region to commit to becoming original parties to the Convention.

Given the history of possession and use of chemical weapons in the region, the initiative also calls for regional states to institute confidence-building measures now by engaging in presignature implementation of appropriate Chemical Weapons Convention provisions.

BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

As with the approach of chemical weapon controls, the proposals build on an existing global approach. The initiative would

Call for strengthening the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) through full implementation of existing BWC provisions and an improved mechanism for information exchange. These measures will be pursued at the five-year Review Conference of the BWC this September.

Urge regional states to adopt biological weapons confidence-building measures.

This initiative complements our continuing support for the continuation of the UN Security Council embargo against arms transfers to Iraq, as well as the efforts of the UN Special Commission to eliminate Iraq's remaining capabilities to use or produce nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them.

COMMITTEE ACTS TO REPLACE ARMS RACE WITH ARMS RESTRAINT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Under the leadership of its Chairman, Rep. Dante B. Fascell (D-FL), the Committee on Foreign Affairs favorably adopted an amendment today to the Foreign Assistance Authorization legislation for Fiscal Year 1992. The Fascell-sponsored amendment provides for an indefinite moratorium on major U.S. arms sales to the Middle East until another arms supplier nation breaks the U.S. moratorium or until it is replaced with a multilateral arms control restraint regime.

In his statement in support of this arms control effort initiated on April 25, 1991 by his Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science, Chairman Fascell said: "In our efforts to not repeat past 'business as usual' arms sales practices in the Middle East, the Committee has just adopted an important arms control initiative."

The Chairman added: "Our action today is intended to jump-start the process—to challenge ourselves and the international community. Just as U.S. initiative and leadership followed by international cooperation was decisive in our success against Iraq, it is needed again to create lasting peace in the Middle East."

The Chairman concluded: "Let us renew those efforts which restored stability and created peace opportunities in the Middle East as opposed to repeating old practices that led to war and impeded peace efforts in the Middle East."

The full text of Chairman Fascell's statement follows:

* This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

"The committee now has before it an amendment dealing with many of our efforts to develop a realistic arms transfer restraint policy for the Middle East and the Persian Gulf regions. The amendment reflects a consensus of the several members of the committee including Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Solarz, Mr. Berman, Mr. Gejdenson, Mr. Levine, and members from the other side of the aisle, as well as that of the chair. This amendment was recommended to the committee by the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science pursuant to its meeting on April 25, 1991.

"At that time, the subcommittee members engaged in a lengthy discussion on what was then referred to as recommendation seventeen. While the subcommittee members expressed general agreement on the desirability and necessity of this concept, there was also a consensus of opinion that recommendation seventeen needed additional fine tuning so as to make it as acceptable as possible to as many members of the committee as was possible.

"To achieve this end, the committee staff have been working in conjunction with the personal staff of members, as well as in informal consultations with representatives of the administration, and with members of the private sector in an effort to bring recommendation seventeen to fruition. In this regard, the amendment that we now have before us serves just that purpose, and reflects the concerns that many of us have on this important issue.

"The members will recall that the original May 6th discussion draft included language establishing, upon enactment, a temporary 120 day moratorium on new arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf regions. Pursuant to that draft, our esteemed colleague—Mr. Berman—offered a proposal that required the President to submit a plan and a feasibility study on a prospective multilateral arms restraint regime. Mr. Berman's proposal also specified that after the 61st day of enactment, an indefinite moratorium on arms transfers would be imposed worldwide—except for NATO—until the President reports that he has undertaken 'good faith efforts' to establish a multilateral restraint regime.

"In an effort to preserve comity, the chair instructed committee staff to attempt to marry the May 6th discussion draft with that of Mr. Berman's proposal. That draft specified that upon the date of enactment, a temporary 120 moratorium on new arms transfers to the Middle East and Persian Gulf regions would be implemented, and that the President must report on his 'good faith efforts' to develop a multilateral restraint regime.

"That particular approach raised the concerns of several members of the committee, most notably respect to the unilateral imposition of the 120 temporary moratorium on new arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. As a result, we have before us an amendment that preserves the concept of an indefinite moratorium that envisions the construct of a multilateral control regime on new arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf regions.

"Nevertheless, the amendment also provides the President with the necessary authority to provide for the replacement of major military equipment on a one-for-one basis of comparable capability after such equipment has become inoperable. The amendment further provides the President with the flexibility to lift the moratorium at anytime after which the President reports

that a major arms supplier nation has reached agreement to transfer any major military equipment to any nation in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, and upon satisfying the reporting requirements on the President's 'good faith efforts' in setting forth a U.S. plan in leading a multilateral control regime and on the feasibility of such a control regime.

"At the same time, the amendment commits the United States to a policy of restraint on arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf through the policy language contained in subsection (b) of the amendment. The amendment also commits the United States to multilateral negotiations among the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and other principal suppliers in an effort to establish a multilateral arms transfer and control regime toward the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

"It should also be noted that the amendment encourages direct negotiations among nations in both the Middle East and the Persian Gulf regions that are aimed at resolving the conflicts within those regions. Finally, the amendment in no way affects the status of the title of pre-positioned U.S. stocks in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf region, nor does it affect the status of any drawdown agreements that have been reached on U.S. stocks that have been made prior to May 21, 1991. In this way, the amendment preserves past U.S. commitments and pre-positioning agreements.

"As I have stated before, the amendment is aimed at jump starting an arms control process in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf through our flexible commitment to a multilateral moratorium on new arms transfers and our call for negotiations on a multilateral arms transfer and control regime. At the same time the amendment is realistic in its approach by allowing the President to report to Congress any new transfer of major military equipment, and in reporting to Congress on 'good faith' U.S. efforts in establishing such a regime. Under these circumstances, the President could submit such reports and proceed in conducting United States arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf consistent with current law.

"While some may argue that current law has its flaws, the chair would only point out that United States law on the conduct of arms transfers sets rigorous standards. The committee rewrite maintains those standards, and improves upon Congressional oversight of those standards. In this regard, the amendment enhances and strengthens those standards as they apply to the process of arms transfers to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. In this way, the amendment reaffirms Congressional leadership, commitment, and dedication to improving the prospects of arms control beyond that of just arms control among the superpowers.

"We all know that this Congressional commitment and dedication to cause of arms control is often times ahead of the curve. And, we all know that Congressional leadership on the issue of arms control often times brings a reluctant executive branch along to the point where it is willing to explore Congressionally mandated arms control ideas. And, we know that this process takes time.

"Nevertheless, the past is replete with examples of success in such endeavors. We all know that it was the Congress that was and remains wary of the potential of an arms race in space that would be caused by United States testing of Anti-Satellite weapons

(ASAT's). To this end, Congress mandated a suspension of the U.S. testing program—a unilateral moratorium if you will—that has resulted in a mutual, U.S.-Soviet commitment to refrain from such testing. As a result, we have avoided a costly and destabilizing arms race in space.

"We all know that it was Congress that set the tone on present improvement of the status of the U.S.-Soviet posture on nuclear testing. In this regard, it was the Congress that passed an amendment in the Senate, and a Joint Resolution in the House that called upon the President to submit the Threshold Test Ban (TTB) and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions (PNE) Treaties to the Senate for ratification, as well as to call upon the President to seek negotiations on the conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This effort was opposed by many in the executive branch but the fact remains today that the TTB and PNE Treaties have been ratified, and that the United States and the Soviet Union are exploring step-by-step process toward a CTB, including a partial test ban amendment conference that took place in January of this year.

"Finally, we all know that it was Congress that opposed United States production of binary chemical munitions and urged the complete destruction of all U.S. chemical munition stockpiles. Those initiatives were also questioned by many in the executive, including the President himself, when as Vice President on two occasions he cast his vote in order to break a tie in the Senate vote to allow binary production. Nevertheless, it is the President last week, who has exerted great leadership and statesmanship in taking unilateral steps which have resulted in bilateral agreement to destroy all U.S. and Soviet chemical weapons, thereby enhancing the prospects for multilateral commitment and agreement on the production, use, stockpiling, possession and transfer of chemical weapons.

"Thus, it is the hope of this amendment to bring greater United States reason, vision and leadership through Congressional dedication and commitment to furthering the cause of arms control in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. This jump start is yet another example of our taking a small step in the right direction. It is a step in which we hope others will follow. It is a step that will, hopefully lead to the furtherance of the peace process in one of the most, if not the most, troubling areas of the world."

TRIBUTE TO VERNE LIND

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Carmichael, CA, who deserves to be recognized for his dedication and service to the public. On Tuesday, May 28, 1991, the Carmichael Chamber of Commerce will meet and honor Mr. Verne Lind by naming him its 1991 Business Person of the Year.

For well over two decades, Mr. Lind has been an important member of our community. He is the past president of the Carmichael Kiwanis Club, and a member of the Elks Lodge and the Carmichael Chamber of Commerce. He has served on the American River Hospital Board of Directors and as a member

of the Hospice Care of Sacramento. Through these charitable organizations, Verne has worked on numerous projects which have directly benefited our community.

Verne Lind has also made important contributions to the business sector. Small businesses are an essential part of our community and we depend on businessmen like Mr. Lind to keep our economy healthy. Verne has been in the funeral business for 42 years and his professional affiliations include the International Associated Funeral Directors Service, National Funeral Directors Association, California Funeral Directors Association, and the Sacramento Area Funeral Directors Association.

Mr. Speaker, Verne Lind has served as an exemplary citizen and I commend him for his many contributions to our local area and to the State of California. I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this outstanding individual and extending to him our best wishes in all his endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO REV. MSGR.
BRENDAN P. MADDEN ON THE
40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS OR-
DINATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 2, 1991, residents of my Eighth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey will join the friends of St. Clare's Church and the parish community in Clifton, NJ, and Rev. Msgr. Brendan P. Madden in celebration of the 40th anniversary of his consecration into the sacrament of holy orders.

Mr. Speaker, we are so proud to have Reverend Monsignor Madden with us in Clifton, NJ. He was ordained on June 3, 1951, by the Most Reverend Thomas Keogh, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin in Ireland. A native of Cork City, Ireland, he studied at Irish National Schools and the Christian Brothers Schools as a grammar school student, and on to high school at St. Finbarr's Minor Seminary and college in St. Patrick's Major Seminary College in Carlow, Ireland.

Monsignor Madden set sail from the Cobh of Cork on August 24, 1951, for the fair city of New York. He arrived 6 days later and reported to the Bishop of Paterson, the late Thomas A. Boland. His first assignment was with the parish of St. Nicholas in Passaic. I am told one of the comments made by the Bishop while granting Monsignor Madden his assignment, was "Don't lose your brogue," from that day forward, Monsignor Madden carried out the request faithfully, returning to Ireland every year since, to brush up on the brogue.

His second assignment was to St. Anthony's parish in Hawthorne, NJ where he spent 6 years, then on to the parish of Our Lady of the Lake in Mount Arlington where in the summer-time, there was a schedule of 16 Masses on Sundays with 3 mission churches in the area. Being appointed as pastor of Our Lady of the Lake, he was soon transferred as pastor of St. Mary's Parish in Denville, NJ. He later served

a short time in St. Monica's Parish in Sussex County and then in 1985, he was assigned to St. Clare's Church in Clifton, NJ.

During his years in the Paterson Diocese, Monsignor Madden served as religion instructor at Morris Catholic High School in Denville. He was cochairman of Communications for the Sussex County Council of Churches, had a monthly radio half-hour program on the Newton Station WNNJ. He was a member of the Wallkill Valley Rotary Club, represented the Sussex County Priests Vicariate on the Diocesan Pastoral Council, and a member of the Priest's Senate. He organized one of the first board of education councils in Catholic Grammar School, and has continued his strong interest in Catholic School education.

Monsignor Madden regularly enjoys golf, traveling, gardening, and looking for ways to beautify the church with floral decorations. He is quite lucky to have several of his Irish school buddies, Msgr. Eugene McQuaid from Holy Spirit in Pequannock and Fr. Martin Connolly, pastor-emeritus of Sacred Heart in Dover, at his side to enjoy this glorious occasion.

Mr. Speaker, as Msgr. Brendan P. Madden celebrates the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, I know that you and all our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations for the excellence of his service to his church, our Nation, and all mankind. We do indeed salute an esteemed pastor, exemplary clergyman, and great American—Rev. Msgr. Brendan P. Madden, of Clifton, NJ.

REMEMBRANCE OF ERIN TINSMAN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Erin Tinsman was a remarkable young woman.

Despite her 10-year battle with leukemia, she never let that disease dominate her spirit. She developed a toughness in the face of adversity that enabled her to endure long hospital stays and intensive chemotherapy over several years and yet graduate from high school as a homebound student. She set a standard of dignity and courage that was an inspiration and example to everyone whose life she touched.

Erin was keenly aware of the impact of her illness on her family and friends. During such difficult times, there is a special bond that develops between even the closest of people who love each other—a mutually shared sensitivity and caring that is both comfort and support. One of the ways Erin sought to sustain her loved ones was through her poems, and I would like to share one of these with my colleagues:

When all is dark and all is gloom,
When you feel useless and feel the doom,
Look toward the light and the brightest star.
Look toward the rainbow, that's the key.
Look toward the sky. Don't you see
That the biggest cloud is me?
I'll watch over you day and night.
See what I am? I'm the bright light—

The Brightest of them all.

The one that'll be there when you call.

—Erin Leigh Tinsman.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Erin's parents, Phyllis and Robert Lee Tinsman, her grandmother, Dorothy Erbel, and her grandparents, Jerry and Ruth Tinsman.

FORTY YEARS OF CHINESE
DOMINATION OF TIBET

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, May 23 marks the anniversary of one of the most tragic events in history. Forty years ago, Chinese Communist troops entered Tibet. Forty years ago, the Chinese began the systematic repression of the Tibetan people. Forty years ago, the Chinese began their effort to eradicate the proud, ancient culture of the Tibetan people. Forty years ago, the Chinese began their struggle to eliminate Tibetan Buddhism and remove His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, as the spiritual leader of the Tibetans.

At the same time, however, we note the courage, the tenacity and the resilience of the Tibetan people. Despite 40 years of brutal repression and foreign dominance, the Tibetan people have persevered. Their culture remains and the Dalai Lama has become a revered figure, not only among Tibetans but for the entire world. He stands as a beacon of nonviolence in the face of outrageous and brutal provocation; as a champion of individual human rights against a brutal, repressive regime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the brave and one-sided struggle of the Tibetan people—those repressed in their homeland as well as those living in lonely exile in foreign lands. Forty years is a long time in the life of an individual but only an instant in the history of this indomitable people. They will prevail, as right and truth and justice ultimately will prevail over the forces of tyranny and oppression. The Tibetan people should know that we—and free people around the world—are with them and join them in this struggle.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO MARY
IURATO, LEADER OF THE
TOTOWA DEMOCRATIC CLUB

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to a special lady and a dynamic leader for the Democratic Party in the city of Totowa and the county of Passaic in my Eighth Congressional District. For 20 years Mary Iurato has served as leader of the Totowa Democratic Club and has helped elect public servants to every level of government.

It is only fitting that such an activist for the democratic process be honored by her peers

at a special surprise brunch. This gala event will be held Sunday, June 2 at the Fairmont in South Little Falls, NJ. Mary has been a resident of my district all of her life. Born and raised in Paterson, she moved to Totowa Boro some 40 years ago when she married Mr. Frank Iurato, who passed away in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Iurato has been active in the Democratic Party for over 30 years, serving as a municipal leader for 20 years, as well as on the county committee, the Democratic Executive Committee, and a judge on the board of elections. Mary also worked as an aide to Assemblyman Bill Bate and was the Totowa Boro campaign coordinator for Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG. In addition, to her political activities, she also served on the Passaic County Park Commission from 1981 to 1986 and was president of that body for two terms.

Mr. Speaker, this exceptional woman has worked constantly for her party and the values of a democratic process. Politicians and advocates in both parties deeply respect her special talents and abilities. For over 30 years Mary Iurato has been a force to be reckoned with in the city of Totowa and in Passaic County. When so many of our voters have fallen into apathy it is refreshing to see there are still people who are determined to be active in their communities and exercise their privilege as voters. Mary has been a quiet but supremely effective part of the political process.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure Mary's two children, her daughter Mrs. Connie Lira and her son Mr. Frank Iurato, Jr., and her three wonderful grandchildren, Frank Iurato III, Jonathan, and Cassandra are extremely proud of her many accomplishments and her unwavering commitment to involvement in the community. Whatever your political affiliation may be, we can all admire and appreciate the dedication and unselfish efforts of an individual who believes in participation.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and all my colleagues to join me in paying a special tribute to a tireless worker for the democratic process and a very extraordinary lady, Mary Iurato.

SALUTE TO BRET SEALEY

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, Bret Sealey, an outstanding young man from my congressional district, will be presented his Eagle Award at a Court of Honor. Bret's dedication to his troop, his family, his school, and his community have helped him achieve the rank of Eagle Scout, the highest rank possible in scouting. I rise today to ask that you join with me in recognizing this truly remarkable individual.

It is important that we take a moment to recognize the true significance of Bret's accomplishment. In recent years, discussions of American youth have tended to focus on their involvement in the problems facing the United States; drug and alcohol abuse, violent crime, and a declining commitment to education and career. Bret is an example of what the youth

in America are capable of and an example of the kind of leadership this country will need if we are to effectively address the problems that face the Nation and the world.

Bret not only has completed a list of required tasks to achieve this honor, he has enriched the lives of those who have had the pleasure of knowing him. It is reassuring to know that there continue to exist individuals like Bret who place value in service to others. While the rank of Eagle Scout is the ultimate in Scouting, I trust it is only the beginning of Bret's achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this inspirational young man.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL CELEBRATES ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, May 28 marks the 30th anniversary of Amnesty International. I rise to congratulate them on their outstanding work over the last three decades as they have fought at the forefront of the struggle for human rights.

Observance of human rights has been the historical mission of the United States. Our country was settled by people escaping persecution. We fought a revolution to free ourselves from the yoke of tyranny. We suffered through a long and bloody civil war to end slavery. We engaged in two world wars to protect human rights. In the aftermath of World War II, it was American leadership, spearheaded by Eleanor Roosevelt during the first session of the United Nations, that produced the landmark document for human rights—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We share the goals Amnesty International seeks—to protect human rights throughout the world, and to help make the world safe for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, amid the recent talk of a new world order, there has been a conspicuous absence of specific language about safeguarding human rights. It is time we asserted our leadership to ensure that respect for the rights of all people around the world is returned to the top of our foreign policy agenda where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Amnesty International and their work over the past 30 years. As citizens of the most free and powerful Nation on Earth, let us work together to restore the issue of human rights to its preeminent place in our policies and our hearts.

SPEECH OF DR. VLADIMIR ZBORILEK BEFORE THE AMERICAN CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIAL CLUB OF NORTH MIAMI, FL.

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the annual birthday celebration of the late T.G. Masaryk, first President-Liberator of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, which was held on March 10 at the American Czechoslovak Social Club in North Miami. This happy event featured traditional Czechoslovak music, dances and foods, which are truly wonderful.

One of the highlights of the celebration was a speech by University of Miami Prof. Vladimir Zborilek about the ideas and significance of President Tomas G. Masaryk, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

The speech follows:

T.G. MASARYK SPEAKS TO US

To speak about Tomas Masaryk before this audience is both a great pleasure and a great challenge to me: it is a pleasure, because I feel that you share my love and admiration for this great man, and challenge, because it is a real task to say—without being superficial—just a few words about this statesman and diplomat, philosopher, sociologist, historian, writer and expert on other aspects of human endeavor. It is why now I would like to limit myself to Masaryk's significance only, particularly for today's Czechoslovakia where the recently gained freedom needs not only a financial and moral support from outside, but also a great deal of self-searching on the part of its citizens. Masaryk is precisely the man who—with his ideas and ideals—may serve as an example to the struggling Czechs and Slovaks weakened economically, spiritually, morally and physically by the 40 years of the Communist oppression.

In what way would a man born in 1850 and living under the conditions so different from the present ones serve as a model and a source of encouragement for younger generations? It is not so much because of the volume of his achievements—as respectable as they may be—but rather because of their quality and their moral foundation. To give you an example of what I mean, let me refer to the poetic words of Svatopluk Cech, one of the prominent Czech poets of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. In his short poem entitled "There Are Enough of Us" (in Czech "Dosti nas") he says:

"We are weak, small.—Enough of such talks! Only he who dispairs this way is weak and small.

Had Hellas and Rome been bigger Before they touched stars with their immortal brows?"

And the poet concludes: "Weak is only the one who has lost faith in himself

And small the one who has only a small goal."

In Czech the poem sounds: "Jsme slabí, malí.—Dosti techto reci! Jen kdo tak zoufa slab a malý jest. Oc byla Hellas, byla Roma vetší, nez skrani nesmrtnou se dotkla hvezd."

And the end: "Slab jenom ten, kdo ztratil v sebe viru,

a maly ten, kdo zna jen maly cil."

Masaryk might have known this poem by Svatopluk Cech. He might have agreed with its patriotic contents, even with its central part which I have left out, but which implies that in a struggle for a cause the greatness and justice of this cause are more important in obtaining a victory than is the number of enemies. Masaryk expressed a similar idea this way:

"* * * a number does not decide everything. We have enough examples showing that small states successfully defeated big ones. In literature and art—generally in the entire field of culture—quality does not depend on the numerical strength."

Whether knowingly or unknowingly, Masaryk shared the poet's idea that a small size does not have to be detrimental to a nation. Historically, philosophically and religiously he was deeply rooted in the period of Husitism, in the 15th century which represents for the Czech nation both the highest point of its military history, as well as the moral superiority of the cause for which it fought.

However, he warned that people "should not lose themselves in memories of their nation's glorious past, but should strive for a glorious present, * * * they should hold to reality."² Reality, however, was for Masaryk a broad concept comprising spirituality, soul, love, moral order, God and eternity. Only by understanding and practicing reality this way may we live a full life of an individual or the life of a nation. Only such a life is, according to Masaryk, without internal conflicts, only such a life has a true and clear sense, only such a life is happy.³

For Masaryk the greatness of the goal, even when the cause is just, was not enough. Every activity, even the fighting, must be carried on with honest means. We know that Masaryk considered honesty and truth among the central virtues of man's life. Men should be good, should love each other, should be tolerant of each other, since without tolerance there can be no love and no true honesty. Tolerance should not be understood in terms of comfortableness and indifference, but rather as a mortal duty, a respect for each other, a true humanity.

Tolerance, of course, did not mean to Masaryk any condoning of wrongs and iniquities, neither was it related to the philosophical concept of non-resistance to evil in the Tolstoyan sense. He makes it quite clear in his description of his third visit to Tolstoy in Yasnaya Polyana in 1910, in the year of Tolstoy's death. Masaryk related that during his visit they had mostly argued about Tolstoy's theory on nonresistance to evil. In Masaryk's view, Tolstoy "did not understand that the question was not only about a violent resistance, but about a fight against evil in general. He did not see the difference between the offensive and the defensive . . ."⁴ And Masaryk concluded:

"My thesis was: If someone attacks me with the intent of killing me, I will defend myself, and if there is no other possibility, I will kill the attacker. If one of the two of us should be killed, let it be the one who has a bad intention."⁵

Just from these few glimpses of Masaryk's ideological life we may conclude that his spiritual, philosophical and moral thoughts did not exist only as theoretical concepts,

but they deeply penetrated into his practical life. On the other hand, as one observer has pointed out, "in his life politics never was pure politics. It always had a strong ingredient of philosophy. In other words, politics was associated with vision."⁶

What was this vision? It was a vision of a free, democratic Czechoslovakia whose citizens would prove by their life that they are worthy of their freedom. This state, in conjunction with other independent states formed as a consequence of the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire would be the first step for a future European federation. Masaryk's first vision became real in 1918 when the Czechoslovak Republic went into being. His second vision, the vision of a federated Europe, is still in the process of ripening.

This is the goal, particularly for the younger generations, to work for. However, they should first turn their attention to their own country making it prosperous and respectable again. Masaryk certainly would give them such advice. Further, they should make his philosophy and practical wisdoms a source of the nation's moral, social and political regeneration which should proceed, hand in hand, with an economic revival. They should listen to such comments of Masaryk, as the following one which evaluates the situation in the young Republic after 1918:

"* * * everything we have done until now is nothing in comparison with what awaits us. We have won, but the work, the real work for which we will need the most courage and strength—and about the difficulties of which hardly anyone has any idea—this real work is beginning only now."⁷

The young generations should listen and act accordingly.

VLADIMIR ZBORILEK (Ph.D.),
University of Miami.
CORAL GABLES, March 7-10, 1991.

THE ILLUSIONS OF SCHOOL CHOICE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1991, President Bush announced his plan for education.

Included in his plan is a program for providing and promoting school choice. The President believes that educational choice for parents and students is critical to improving our schools. Although the President indicates that the administration will be sending to Congress a more detailed plan soon, one provision in his initial plan is for a \$200 million Education Certificate Program support fund which will provide incentive grants to local school districts with qualified education certificate programs that enhance parental choice. In addition, he is asking for a national school choice demonstration project which will be supported through a \$30 million initiative.

The fundamental premise of all of this is that a higher quality of education can be made available if parents have the opportunity to

shop around for the best schools. There is no evidence showing that there has been any measurable improvement in the academic performance of students where choice was utilized. The primary objective of public education is to provide the highest level of education available to all 40 million pupils enrolled in our Nation's public schools. School choice is a limited response that may or may not work for a few. We must be concerned with all children; particularly, those who are left behind in schools that are seen as less attractive. Our national focus should be directed toward spending monetary resources to improve all of our schools as opposed to a selected few.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the issue of school choice I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial listed below which was included in the New York Times last month:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1991]

SCHOOL CHOICE, WITHOUT HARM

President Bush wholeheartedly supports "parental choice" as a way to improve America's public schools. In announcing his new education plan, he said that giving parents more flexibility to choose schools "will create the competitive climate that stimulates excellence in our private and parochial schools as well."

This is revolutionary change from the tradition of assigning pupils to public schools based on where they live. But thus far Mr. Bush has been remarkably vague about how he envisions such "choice" plans in practice. The idea is outlined sketchily in three sentences in a strategy document, amplified by five sentences in a fact sheet.

There one learns that the President would provide \$230 million for demonstrations and incentive grants and would incorporate choice into the largest Federal school aid program—the \$6 billion Chapter 1 program providing desperately needed remedial education to disadvantaged children.

The choice approach has some attractions. It would provide a way out for bright or ambitious students currently trapped in inferior neighborhood schools, who might well blossom if allowed to choose a better school. And, if applied successfully, it might force weak schools to improve lest they lose their students to better schools.

But the Administration ought not embark on such radical change unless it can insure that the neediest students won't be left even worse off than before, in disintegrating schools that have been stripped of their best and brightest.

Since 1965, Washington has tried to provide equal opportunity for students who are economically and educationally at risk through the Chapter 1 program. Money is given to schools that serve a high proportion of poor students. It is generally spent on the lowest achievers, who receive remedial help in subjects like reading and math.

Recently, Federal rules have allowed any school where poor children constitute 75 percent of enrollment to use Chapter 1 funds for schoolwide services, like lowering class sizes in all grades, hiring reading teachers or guidance counselors. Thus, many schools, particularly in low-income urban areas, now rely on Chapter 1 funds to improve instruction for all students.

Mr. Bush now proposes to convert Chapter 1, allowing eligible students to choose any school they wish to attend, whether public, private or parochial, and their pro-rated share of the program's funds would follow.

¹ K. Capek, "Hovory s T.G.M." Fr. Borovy, Cin. Praha, 1937, p. 308.

² Ibid., p. 315.

³ See *ibid.*

⁴ Ibid., p. 102.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ G.J. Kovtun, "Masaryk's New Europe," in Czechoslovak and Central European Journal, Vol. 8, No. 1/2, 1989.

⁷ Quoted in C5s. Tydenik, February 28, 1991.

Giving bright, highly motivated low-income students more educational options is not only desirable, but imperative. Too many of these students are trapped in public schools that continue to operate despite poor performance.

But what about the less motivated, most troubled students, who are ill equipped to exercise choice and might be rejected if they did? Washington's emphasis ought to be on improving the weak public schools for them, or on attaching enough money to each student so that better schools would want to compete for even the dullest and most poorly behaved. Unless the Administration is willing to promote quality education for all students, its plan will be little more than a publicly funded scholarship program for the bright and restless.

CONSTITUENT OPINIONS ON NATIONAL HEALTH CARE

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the need for health care reform is one of the most pressing issues that Congress will have to address in the near future. We know it. And our constituents know it. As we begin to take up this issue in earnest, the letters of concern and support regarding reform are beginning to flood in. In reading the letters from my own constituents I have found many of their comments to be very interesting. Many of them express a sense of urgency that I do not believe has hit Washington yet, but I guarantee you that it will. Therefore, I would like to request that the following excerpts from letters I have received be included in the RECORD. It is essential that we understand what our constituents are thinking on this important issue.

A woman from St. Paul, MN:

"The present system of market based health care coverage is both costly and discriminatory to individuals and the business community . . . The current health care system insures fewer people and costs a higher percentage of our nation's GNP than industrialized countries which have national health insurance. Although I strongly believe that employers should pay part of the cost any national health insurance plan created, since they benefit from having healthy workers, it no longer makes sense to tie health insurance to individual jobs or employers.

"Health care access should not be a function of having the right job or being fortunate enough to not develop a health problem. I urge Congress to develop a national health care plan which will allow all Americans access to affordable care."

A retired health care worker:

"I strongly support a system of national health care for everyone. I don't care what it costs! I pay taxes and would be willing to pay more to be certain that every American has access to appropriate care and treatment. When Congress puts a plan in place we will all be surprised by the past inefficiencies and inequities inherent in our present systems."

Several members of the Board of Directors at HealthEast:

"There is an appropriate role for government in addressing these issues. But, that role is not necessarily as 'Big Brother' who

solves the problems for us. Rather, government, employers, organized labor, senior and other advocacy groups, physicians, hospitals and other health care providers must work together in partnership to systematically identify and discuss the problems we face and forge solutions that are in the best interests of all parties. Too often, past efforts to solve these problems have been undertaken with disregard for the very people who are providing the service."

A retired State Highway Patrol Officer from Roseville, MN:

"While we do not object to 'paying our share,' it is apparent to me that medical expenses and the many, varied taxes will soon consume 50 percent of our limited retirement pay."

An uninsured home health care aid and certified nursing assistant:

Said that she delays her own medical treatment due to lack of finances. Even so, her primary health care concern was for the elderly people she cares for in their homes. "I am writing basically for them as I hear concern and worry from them that with cutbacks from government, they could be cut off from their home health care. To these people, and I'm sure to many other people, it means the difference between staying in their homes or going to a nursing home."

A nursing student:

"I am in support of a National Health Care policy that would cover every citizen of the United States. I am in favor of this due to my concern that human beings are being turned away from health care because they lack insurance or are underinsured. This affects me due to the fact I [will soon be a nurse, and pledged] to give care to every person, regardless of their ability to pay. It burdens my heart that money is the criteria to acquire medical care."

A man from Mounds View, MN:

"I think that a socialized system will only result in an increase in corruption and increased costs. I agree we have a problem but there must be a free market solution."

A man from Roseville, MN:

"To me the greatest problem with the medical industry is that there is no buyer/seller relationship. This can also be thought of as a blank check system. There is no discussion of prices or values etc. When everything is done you are given a bill and told to pay it. . . I do not have the solution to these problems however, I wish you luck and encouragement in working on them."

A doctor:

"It is time to make the business of health care responsive to the needs of the people. Doctor-bashing involves understandable but misplaced frustration in regards to health care costs. I would make the following suggestions:

"Health insurance companies should be regulated to ensure that a certain basic portion of each premium dollar is spent on health care;

"Advertising and policies for HMO enrollees should be presented in 'plain English' laying out restrictions, co-pays, and conflicts of interest;

"Insurance companies ability to select-out certain risk groups should be restricted to spread the risk and the expenses across larger populations.

"I hope you can help with this issue. Consumers and their doctors are being short-changed by corporations which are taking the buck and passing on the responsibility."

A businessman from St. Paul, MN:

"I am in favor of National Health Insurance to make health care available to all

citizens of the United States. Other countries have National Health Insurance and spend less on health care as a result."

A woman who worked in the health insurance industry:

"I agree the present health care system has access problems and cost problems. However, our current health care delivery system is the best in the world. Therefore, we should try fixing the present system before abandoning it. As we strive to find a solution, we need to remember health care access and affordability of health care are very complex issues that do not have easy solutions."

A woman from White Bear Lake, MN:

"Health organizations should be in business to provide a service and not for profit at all costs!

"Sooner or later everyone will have medical problems—it is a joke and a bad joke, that health providers can deny a person coverage on a preexisting condition because they changed jobs or have cancer strike a second time."

A chiropractor from Shoreview, MN:

"You are doing all Minnesotans and the nation a great service by discussing this issue at the hearing. As you stated in your newsletter, Minnesota has one of the best health care systems in the nation. I agree with you wholeheartedly. However, I am concerned about the welfare of the many thousands of Minnesotans who depend upon chiropractic care for their health, and of those Minnesotans who might want chiropractic care. . . I sincerely hope that chiropractic care is included in the improvements that are discussed."

A man from St. Paul, MN:

"The National Policy on health care should be that those who can afford it should receive it. Health insurance is a privilege not a right, and I would like to have somebody prove it any differently."

A Medical Technologist from St. Paul, MN:

"I believe we need a National Health Care program that is equal access to all people. We need one program—one that includes veterans, Senior Citizens, babies and those in between. We need limits placed on care given and lifestyles definitely have to be considered. Health care costs at all levels are rising. A national program will hopefully limit increases in cost of drugs, hospitalization and other related costs."

Another man from St. Paul, MN:

"I am in favor of a national health plan of some sort . . . that covers every individual without favor to the wealthy; a 'socialized' system of sorts after the Canadian model (in which health costs are a smaller percentage of their GNP than here (here approximately 12%.) Health care should be as guaranteed/basis as FICA responsibilities, without profit abuses by providers."

A businessman from St. Paul:

"As the president of a company that factors freight bills with 80 employees I support free market forces over government control of resources. In my limited experience, government intervention can add substantially to cost when the quality of an quantity of the product or service decline. The deregulation of the trucking industry has resulted in a 50% reduction of shipping costs."

A woman from Little Canada, MN:

"I and my husband are older citizens concerned for all those who do not have the means for health insurance. Could we possible set up a national plan so everyone would have some help, other than Medicare. Little children on the streets, the unemployed, elderly without enough income . . . there's got to be some way we can solve these problems."

A BILL TO REFORM THE FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to curb the influence of special interests in the legislative process by providing direct public funding for candidates for the House of Representatives. This bill establishes a voluntary system of public financing for candidates who agree to abide by spending limits, with partial funding provided for primary elections, and full funding for general elections. It also provides restrictions on soft money, independent expenditures, and bundling.

This bill is similar to, though more comprehensive, than bills I have sponsored in each of the last three Congresses to establish a campaign finance system for the House of Representatives based on the successful system that has been in effect for the last four Presidential elections. It would provide an effective response to the four criticisms most frequently leveled at our campaign practices: Candidates' reliance on special-interest money for a large portion of their funds; the rising cost of running for office; the huge amount of time and effort candidates spend on fundraising; and the enormous advantage to incumbents that has resulted from the existing system.

In primary elections, candidates who agree to participate would be subject to a \$200,000 spending limit, and could only accept small, individual contributions—\$250 or less. Funds raised from in-State individual contributors would be matched 2 to 1 by the Treasury, in \$10,000 increments. Out-of-State contributions would not be matched, and contributions from PAC's would not be permitted. As a further incentive for participating, candidates would be eligible for mail and broadcast discounts.

In general elections, participating candidates would also be subject to a \$200,000 spending limit in the general elections, and would receive a grant from the Treasury in that amount upon receiving their party's nomination. Candidates would be eligible for mail and broadcast discounts during the general election as well.

Nonparticipating candidates could raise and spend an unlimited amount of money, but they could not receive more than \$250 from any individual or \$1,000 from any PAC during either the primary or the general election, and they would be ineligible for mail and broadcast discounts. If the nonparticipating candidate raised or spent over \$200,000 in the primary, his or her publicly funded opponent would no longer be subject to the spending limit. If the nonparticipating candidate spent over \$200,000 in the general election, the Treasury would give his or her opponent \$1 dollar for every dollar he raised or spent over \$200,000. Thus, there would be little incentive for not participating.

The bill would also curb soft money abuses by prohibiting State and Federal political parties from using donations not regulated under

Federal law on activities to influence a Federal election, and prohibiting candidates for Federal office from soliciting such contributions. It would also limit Federal and State party spending on activities which aid Federal candidates. Federal candidates would be prohibited from raising money for nonprofit, voter-registration organizations.

Additionally, this bill would curb independent expenditures by providing that publicly funded candidates who are targeted by an independent expenditure campaign be given \$10,000 from the Treasury for every \$10,000 spent against them, and offered the opportunity for a media response immediately following the one paid for through the independent expenditure.

Finally, this bill would stop the practice of bundling by making individual contributions that are packaged together count as a contribution from one single individual.

This legislation would provide the fundamental change in our campaign finance system that is needed to remove the influence of money in the legislative process. No longer would House candidates need to give their time and attention to PAC's and wealthy individuals to raise the money they need to run for office. Members of Congress would be free to work on solving the serious problems this country faces without worrying about how particular contributors or potential contributors view their actions.

Furthermore, this new system of financing would make House elections more competitive because it would give challengers the same financial resources that incumbents have.

Figures from the 1990 election show how strongly the existing system works in favor of incumbents. PAC's, which provided the majority of funds for more than half of the successful House candidates in the 1990 House elections, gave nearly 13 times as much money to incumbents as to challengers. Clearly, PAC money has to be curbed if we are going to have competitive elections. However, candidates need a viable source of funding, and the only such source, realistically, is public funding.

The existing system is also fueling the term limitation movement. If we do not change it to encourage more competitive elections, frustration over the unfairness of the election process is going to lead an increasing number of voters to support limiting the number of years any person can serve in the House.

To function effectively, our system of government depends on public confidence and trust. Nothing would do more to restore that trust, in my opinion, than to establish a campaign finance system that assures voters that the U.S. Representative they elect will be more responsive to them than to campaign contributors. This bill would establish such a system.

Below is a summary of the bill:

KEY FEATURES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1991

PRIMARY ELECTIONS—PARTIAL PUBLIC FINANCING

For participating major-party candidates: Spending limit of \$200,000.

Treasury provides \$2 for every \$1 raised from in-State source, in \$10,000 increments (after first \$10,000 is raised).

No contributions from PACs permitted.

Individual contribution limit of \$250.

Out-of-state contributions are permitted, but are not matched.

Mail and broadcast discounts provided.

For non-participating major-party candidates:

Individual contribution limit of \$250.

PAC contribution limit of \$1,000.

If candidate spends more than \$200,000, spending limits are removed for publicly funded opponent, who may continue to receive matching funds.

For both types of candidates:

Personal contribution limit of \$250.

Party contribution limit of \$5,000 (which does not count toward the \$10,000 threshold for receiving public matching funds).

No contributions may be received earlier than 6 months before the primary.

Unused funds revert to Treasury.

GENERAL ELECTIONS—FULL PUBLIC FINANCING

For participating major-party candidates:

Spending limit of \$200,000.

Candidate receives \$200,000 in Federal funds upon receiving party's nomination.

Mail and broadcast discounts provided.

For non-participating major-party candidates:

Individual contribution limit of \$250.

PAC contribution limit of \$1,000.

Personal contribution limit of \$250.

Party contribution limit of \$5,000.

For every \$1 candidate raises or spends over \$200,000, his publicly funded opponent receives \$1 in Federal funds.

For both types of candidates:

Unused funds in excess of \$10,000 revert to Treasury.

MINOR-PARTY CANDIDATES

Minor party defined as party whose candidate received between 5 and 25 percent of total votes in last three elections.

Candidates eligible for matching funds in primary under same formula as major-party candidates.

Candidates receive funding for general election according to same formula used for Presidential system.

New party candidates who receive more than 5 percent of vote are eligible for funds for reimbursement after general election.

MAIL AND BROADCAST DISCOUNTS

First class mail would be available at one quarter the regular rate for candidate mailings; third-class rates would be 2 cents lower than first class.

Broadcasters would be required to charge participating candidates a maximum of 50 percent of the lowest unit charged for the same amount of time for the same time of the day and day of the week.

SOFT MONEY

Prohibits state and federal political parties from using donations not regulated under federal law on activities to influence a federal election, and prohibits candidates for federal office from soliciting such donations.

Limits state and federal party spending on activities which aid federal candidates to 30 cents per voter; state party spending on Presidential elections to 4 cents per voter.

Prohibits federal candidates from soliciting donations for nonprofit voter-registration organizations.

INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

Independent expenditures are counted as expenditures for the candidate on whose behalf the expenditure was made.

Publicly funded candidate who is target of independent expenditure may receive additional \$10,000 of public funds for every \$10,000 spent against him.

Allows candidate who is target of independent expenditure to buy broadcast time immediately following broadcast time paid for by independent expenditure.

BUNDLING

Requires that any contributions made through an intermediary be treated as if they were made by the intermediary.

SOURCE OF PUBLIC FUNDING

Funds made available through appropriations.

NEW WORLD ORDER REQUIRES NEW UNITED NATIONS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "new world order" has gained wide currency since President Bush began to use it last fall. But what does the phrase mean? What kind of new world order will serve America's needs and the needs of all nations?

These are the major questions examined in an insightful article that appeared earlier this year in the Philadelphia Inquirer, "U.N. Should Lead the 'New Order'", written by Dr. John Logue, Director of the Common Heritage Institute. They are questions each of us will be hearing more about in the coming months, and I believe that Dr. Logue's ideas are worthy of wider recognition and consideration.

U.N. SHOULD LEAD THE 'NEW ORDER'

(By John Logue)

Congress and the country seem to be intrigued by three words, "new world order," which President Bush brought into public discourse in September and reiterated in his Wednesday night television speech shortly after the Persian Gulf war began. Fascination with the phrase was evident in last week's great debate in Congress on whether to authorize military action against Iraq. It will surely continue as the war continues and, it is hoped, when it is over.

Members of Congress sensed that something is basically wrong with the existing world order. So does the peace community. Both would welcome a "new world order" that doesn't require the world to go to war to enforce world law. But what kind of "new world order"? And how do we get it?

President Bush has told us that his "new world order" will be beneficial to all, but he hasn't told us what it will look like. One suspects that he is telling us by his actions that it means American hegemony. That implies that American troops and American funding will be made available for purposes that the United States deems worthy.

It implies that a compliant U.N. Security Council will be asked to give its blessing to U.S. initiatives but not to recruit significant troop support or funding for them. Bush's dynamic American hegemony is to replace the phlegmatic U.S.-Soviet hegemony that, in spite of its faults and mistakes, managed to keep world peace—though not regional peace—for more than 40 years.

The naive might have supposed that the peace community would rejoice that the U.N. system of "collective security" was finally working in the gulf war.

Proper procedures were followed. Military action was authorized by the Security Council and by Congress. But did the peace com-

munity applaud when Congress gave the President a green light to use force? Understandably, it did not. Indeed the apprehension of those who supported the President was almost as great as that of those who opposed him.

Congress and the country sensed that they were faced with an unfair choice: Let the war-maker, Saddam Hussein, keep Kuwait, or authorize a war—of unknown length, ferocity and results—to free Kuwait. Critics pointed out that only a handful of U.N. members were putting up their share of troops or financing. But that is how collective security works, if it works.

Fifty years ago Walter Lippmann, the most influential columnist of his time, spoke of the fatal flaw in collective security, which is the U.S. system of enforcement. That flaw did in the League of Nations. He said that "when the issue is less than the survival of the great nations, the method of collective security will not be used because it is just as terrifying to the policeman as it is to the lawbreaker." Lippmann rejoiced in the veto because it meant that the dangerous system of collective security would seldom, if ever, be used. He put his faith in bipolar hegemony.

The world can't, won't and shouldn't go back to bipolar hegemony. If American hegemony stalls, the world will probably return to the anarchy of the years before and after World War I. But that anarchy will be much more dangerous because of developments in military technology and the increasing interdependence of nations.

Wars, covert action and an increase in the qualitative arms race seem inevitable unless responsible people have the wisdom to discover what a desirable and effective world order requires and the courage and skill to rouse popular demand for it.

What does it require?

A just, effective and stable "new world order" will require a reformed and restructured United Nations with the power, authority and funding to carry out its basic purposes, including keeping the peace and promoting economic and social justice, human rights and protection of the global environment. It must be able to enforce U.N. law on individuals, whether hijackers, drug traffickers, tax dodgers, invading generals or their political superiors, e.g., Saddam Hussein.

It will have to have its own sources of revenue, not be dependent on national governments. It will require the elimination of the great power veto in the Security Council and a change in the one nation-one vote rule in the General Assembly. It probably will require a new U.N. Charter since the veto probably will not permit radical change in the existing United Nations.

Restructuring and empowerment of the United Nations must be combined with settlement of certain urgent problems such as the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. But most of those problems will be much easier to settle, to mutual satisfaction, if the United Nations is radically strengthened.

A "new world order" based on a new United Nations could work. But George Bush's "new world order" can't work for very long. Neither can anarchy. The sad fact is that, with minor exceptions, neither Congress nor the peace community nor academia is working to radically restructure and empower the United Nations. Surely they must share some of the blame for the fact that the United Nations, with less power and funding than the state of Connecticut, cannot do the job that cries out to be done.

JEAN BOOKER: AFRICAN-AMERICAN MOTHER OF THE YEAR 1990

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article about Mrs. Jean Booker. Mrs. Booker was recently honored by the New York Carib News with their Front Page Award. Lady Booker is a dedicated mother, scholar, and civic activist who is evidence of the perseverance and dedication to excellence that often goes unrecognized in the African-American community.

The article, which appeared in the New York Carib News on May 14, 1991, follows:

JEAN BOOKER HONORED WITH CARIB NEWS

"FRONT PAGE AWARD"

(By Melinda Etheridge)

Mother of all mothers, Mrs. Jean Booker, was honored recently by the New York Carib News with the weekly publication's Front Page Award.

To describe the Honorable Jean Booker, one would have to write a book. Lady Booker has done so very much in her lifetime and the many lives she's touched in this lifetime she's turned to gold.

This whirlwind individual's educational achievement includes graduate studies at the New School For Social Research, the Henry George Institute and the Columbia University School of Journalism.

A year ago, in May of 1990, Mrs. Booker was named African-American Mother of the Year. At that time she said that "the most rewarding thing to happen, for me, was giving birth to Rev. James E. Booker Jr., who preaches the Gospel."

Today, states Mrs. Booker, "On a scale of all joys that I've known, first is giving birth to my son, Rev. James E. Booker, second is being saved, third is getting a magnificent daughter-in-law Crystal who is like my own child, fourth is becoming a grandmother to Elizabeth Ashley, fifth is learning about sex, and sixth is getting the Front Page Award."

Although her joyous experiences have grown, her idea of rewarding parenting has not changed. "Parents are the first role models that children see, therefore parents set examples that their children follow," Mrs. Booker was quoted at the time she was named African-American Mother of the Year 1990.

The Carib News reporter, who interviewed Mrs. Booker on that day recalls his first encounter with the "famous humanitarian." "I remember now, it was a chilly morning in Harlem and we had gathered to see a famous humanitarian present a couple tons of food to benefit the needy of Harlem . . . That event took place on the compound of the Salvation and Deliverance Church . . . She radiated a certain warmth . . . The cold weather was no match for the undaunting spirits of Jean Booker," wrote Michael Roberts.

According to the Harlemite, who is vice-president and Religious Account Executive of the Booker Group, "It (the award) was special because of the people who gave it to me . . . To be given by people (mothers), who have similar experiences made it more worthwhile and most beautiful."

Mrs. Booker jointly accepted the Front Page Award on Sunday with her son, while her daughter-in-law Crystal and precious

baby Elizabeth Ashley the very special people in her life, watched.

Mrs. Booker was presented a trip for two to Jamaica compliments of Air Jamaica and Ciboney Resorts, in Ocho Rios, various corporate gifts, specially prepared Bahamas cuisine by 1985 Caribbean-American Mother of the Year Oggie Green, and a special presentation of long stemmed roses from long-time friend Cathy Connors.

"Jean and I have been special friends for many years . . . I have learned a lot from her and she has learned a lot from me . . . She is very supportive and caring . . . We both believe that mothers and fathers play the first roles in a child's life especially during the first year, what they learn will sustain a child all of its life," stated Connors.

Mrs. Booker, who is a well known community and civic activist said of the Sixth Annual Mothers of the Year celebration, "It was a wonderful family day . . . The tone was set by friendliness and the concern that people had for others . . .

FREE TRADE WITH MEXICO

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 29, 1991 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FREE TRADE WITH MEXICO

Last June President Bush and President Salinas of Mexico committed themselves to achieving a free trade agreement between our two countries. Such a commitment would have been unthinkable for Mexico just a few years ago, but there have been dramatic changes in Mexico's economic policy. If negotiations succeed, a U.S.-Mexico free trade agreement will mark a watershed in breaking down historical barriers which have for too long consigned relations with our most populous neighbor to bitterness and distrust.

CHANGING MEXICAN PERSPECTIVE

Government policy and popular opinion in Mexico have traditionally reflected a fear of U.S. domination of their economy. Although Mexico's population of 88 million is about one third the U.S. population, its economy is less than 1/20th the size of ours. To prevent foreign and particularly U.S. domination, Mexico tightly restricted trade and investment until the mid-1980s with high tariffs, licenses for virtually all imports, and export requirements for foreign investors. Mexicans have come to view this system as harming their economy, which has been in a slump for the last decade. Encouraging Mexicans to adopt a more outward-looking economic policy have been the rapid growth of their export sector and the recognition that the only way to obtain high-tech investment is to loosen trade and investment rules.

"Fast Track": Trade negotiations with Mexico have been on hold until Congress decides whether to give "fast track" treatment to the results of the negotiations. Fast track is a special procedure that requires an up-or-down vote, with no amendments, by both houses of Congress within 90 days after the President submits a trade agreement. U.S. and Mexican trade negotiators have said that they would be unable to reach an agreement if Congress is later able to amend the package.

The fast track procedure was devised in the early 1970s as a compromise between the President and Congress. Trade agreements are difficult to handle under our system of government. The President's negotiators commit the U.S. in an agreement to change its laws, but only Congress can enact those changes. U.S. negotiators had found foreign governments reluctant to negotiate because the possibility of congressional amendments gave the U.S. a second chance to obtain concessions. And Congress had found Presidents increasingly trying to circumvent its role in the process. The fast track procedure has been used successfully for several recent trade agreements.

The vote in Congress last week to extend fast track authority for two more years means that the U.S.-Mexico negotiations can now go forward. The President is required to consult with Congress regularly during the negotiations.

Political Benefits: In my view the main benefits of a U.S.-Mexico free trade agreement would be political. Our relations with Mexico have frequently been strained, as Mexico has consistently felt slighted, if not oppressed, in our bi-lateral dealings. A relationship of increased inter-dependence has been in the making since domestic factors forced Mexico to open its economy in the mid-1980s. A free trade arrangement would reward that progress and encourage the continuation of current trends.

The U.S. has a significant interest in a stable, healthy Mexican economy. Our recent frictions with Mexico—immigration, environmental hazards, and illegal drugs—are closely tied to Mexico's poverty. Moreover, success with Mexico could lead to market-opening arrangements with other Latin American countries. These countries have undertaken difficult reforms to become more market-oriented and democratic. A U.S.-Mexico agreement would bolster these efforts.

Concerns: The debate over fast track for a Mexican trade agreement has raised a number of serious concerns, including worker health and safety, wage rates, increased immigration, and environmental conditions. In a recent letter to Congress, President Bush promised to work to address these concerns, either in the free trade talks or in parallel efforts with the Mexican government. As the talks proceed, Congress will be monitoring these issues and will have the opportunity to reject the entire agreement should they not be satisfactorily addressed.

Probably the biggest worry about free trade with Mexico is that it may lead to a loss of jobs or drop in wages for American workers. Much depends upon the response of multinational companies on both sides of the border, which is difficult to predict. Some studies have concluded that the U.S. would gain jobs overall because Mexican trade barriers are currently higher than U.S. barriers. Proponents of an agreement also point out that it is preferable for low-paying jobs to shift to Mexico than to Asia, because production next door means that U.S. companies have a better chance of supplying machinery and components.

Since Mexico's economy is less than 4% the size of ours and its products account for only 6% of our imports, the economic threats and opportunities from a free trade agreement can easily be overstated. Previous dire warnings about major U.S. job losses overall from lower trade barriers under the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the Canadian Free Trade Agreement turned out to be wrong. Moreover, in the mid-1980s many trade bar-

riers between the U.S. and Mexico were reduced, and the impact on U.S. exports has been encouraging. While our imports from Mexico have risen from \$20 billion in 1987 to \$30 billion in 1990, our exports to Mexico have doubled, reaching a total of \$28 billion in 1990.

I am concerned about the impact on U.S. jobs of a free trade agreement, and I favor steps to help soften the blow. I support assistance and training for workers displaced by free trade with Mexico, and favor a 10-year phase-out of the tariffs to provide time for adequate adjustment. I also believe that it may be necessary to retain some forms of protection in trade with Mexico. Our free trade agreement with Canada contains a variety of special provisions covering products ranging from cars to beer.

As the negotiations with Mexico proceed over the next year, Congress will closely monitor their progress. As we have made clear in previous major trade negotiations, we seek a good agreement and believe that no agreement is preferable to a bad one.

PASS THE OLDER AMERICANS FREEDOM TO WORK ACT, NOW

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with well over 200 of my colleagues in co-sponsoring the Older Americans Freedom to Work Act.

The Social Security earnings limit is an outrageous attack on the financial well-being of this Nation's senior citizens. Older Americans deserve the right to be financially independent. Penalizing an individual by linking Social Security benefits to earned income is both unfair and wrong. It amounts to a massive income tax on beneficiaries who wish to continue to be active in the work force.

Social Security benefits are not a privilege; they are a "right," earned during the course of a worker's career. To tell a person that because of age they must either quit working or lose their prescribed rights is an injustice. As the population of America continues to age with the maturation of the baby boomers, our seniors are going to become an important national resource, if we will encourage them to remain active in the daily business of our country. H.R. 967 takes a crucial step in that direction by repealing the earnings limit placed on Social Security beneficiaries.

Last Congress this legislation collected 265 cosponsors from across the political spectrum. So far in the early months of the 102d Congress, H.R. 967 has collected a bipartisan list of 235 Members of the House of Representatives. With this kind of broad support it is time for the Congress to act on this important issue.

America's elderly citizens deserve the right to continue in the work force without facing the loss of their important Social Security benefits.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in supporting legislation which will expand the availability of substance abuse treatment services to pregnant women. Today I am introducing, along with PETER KOSTMAYER of Pennsylvania and 45 other colleagues, a bill to give States the option to provide substance abuse treatment services to pregnant women and their children under Medicaid.

With this measure, we hope to extend the opportunity for recovery from substance abuse to those who have been effectively shut out of the existing network of substance abuse treatment services. Existing treatment programs serve only about 11 percent of pregnant women in need of substance abuse treatment. A 1987 study conducted in New York City has shown that many substance abuse treatment providers refuse to treat Medicaid-eligible pregnant women. An even greater number of providers studied did not accept Medicaid-eligible pregnant women who were addicted to crack cocaine.

Meanwhile, as many as 375,000 babies are born each year who have experienced prenatal exposure to drugs. Thousands more are born with fetal alcohol syndrome, and prenatal alcohol abuse ranks as the leading cause of preventable mental retardation. Drug-exposed infants have placed an incredible burden on our foster care system, with the General Accounting Office confirming that nearly 30 percent of these infants are being placed in foster care. And a 1990 study of five major cities by the National Black Child Development Institute found that 36 percent of the foster care placements were related to drug abuse.

The measure I am introducing would attack these problems by giving Medicaid-eligible women access to comprehensive residential substance abuse treatment. The bill would permit Medicaid coverage of residential drug and alcohol treatment to pregnant women, allowing women to remain with their children while receiving treatment. The bill sets standards for quality care; affords pregnant women a drug-free environment in which to seek treatment; and would provide counseling for sexual and domestic abuse, which are often contributing factors to the substance abuse problem.

One of the biggest problems faced by pregnant drug and alcohol abusers is the fragmentation of needed services. Limits on the provision of substance abuse treatment services under Medicaid make them largely inaccessible to pregnant women. Current Medicaid law covers inpatient detoxification and some types of outpatient addiction treatment services, but stops there. Medicaid-eligible pregnant women must seek prenatal care and family support services elsewhere within the system of Federal, State, or local programs.

In light of current limits on Medicaid coverage, perhaps the most important aspect of this legislation is that pregnant women would

receive these services in a residential setting. In its June 1990 White Paper on drug treatment, the Office of National Drug Control Policy indicated that the structured residential treatment—or "therapeutic community"—modality is the most effective for addicted pregnant women. A 1990 House Ways and Means Committee report noted that while the best drug treatment programs for pregnant women and women with children involve the entire family, few offer comprehensive treatment that coordinates services among agencies or provides intensive crisis intervention services to families.

Last year, the bill received the endorsement of a wide range of groups concerned about substance abuse among pregnant women, including the National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors, the American College of Nurse-Midwives, the Southern Regional Project on Infant Mortality, and the National District Attorney's Association. This spring, a chief item on the agenda of the Urban Summit, a coalition of mayors from across the Nation, called for the expansion of Medicaid to cover comprehensive residential substance abuse treatment services for pregnant and postpartum women and their children. In a 1991 study entitled "Treating Drug Problems," the Institute of Medicine endorsed changes in Federal Medicaid legislation to address drug treatment needs.

While several States are resorting to punitive measures against pregnant women and mothers who abuse drugs or alcohol, these measures are not an effective deterrent to substance abuse among women. On the contrary, the threat of incarceration or loss of custody can be a significant deterrent to women who would otherwise seek treatment for their substance abuse problem. The National Women's Law Center has pointed out that residential treatment programs cost about the same as incarceration, but provide additional health benefits for the mother and child. Widely available comprehensive substance abuse treatment, rather than punitive measures, must be implemented if the Nation is to see any positive impact on the problem of substance abuse among women, particularly among those who are pregnant or who have children.

In a time of tight budgets and hard choices, the Medicaid Family Care Act is by far the best approach to a complex and far-reaching problem, because of its potential for preventing the breakup of addiction-affected families and the resulting social costs. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill, and to actively support this and other long-term solutions to the problem of substance abuse in families.

THE PITTSBURGH PENGUINS

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pittsburgh Penguins for winning the 1990-91 National Hockey League Stanley Cup Championship. The Penguins captured the title Saturday night with a smash-

ing 8 to 0 rout of the Minnesota North Stars to win the series 4 games to 2.

Yesterday at this time, 80,000 western Pennsylvanians attended an official Stanley Cup victory party for the Penguins at Pittsburgh's Point State Park. Unofficially, an estimated 50,000 fans welcomed the team home at 3:30 a.m. Sunday morning at the Greater Pittsburgh International Airport.

Mr. Speaker, a new era has begun for the Pittsburgh Penguins and their fans. With their mediocre past years behind them, the Penguins, led by Coach Bob Johnson and superstar center and team captain, Mario Lemieux, are embarking on a new era in Pittsburgh Penguin hockey. After finishing this season in grand style, I'm sure the Penguins and their faithful fans can look forward to prosperous performances next year and in many years to come.

Championship teams are nothing new to Pittsburgh, "The City of Champions." Together, the Pittsburgh Pirates and Steelers have made my people proud with their great accomplishments. Pittsburgh now joins the elite club of New York and Chicago as host cities which have won a World Series, a Superbowl, and a Stanley Cup.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in saying "hat's off" to the Pittsburgh Penguins for winning this year's Stanley Cup.

TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA C. T. READ

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, June 2, 1991, will be a very special day in the community to Flushing, OH, located in my 18th Congressional District of Eastern Ohio, but it will be even more significant for a former resident of Flushing, Mrs. Victoria C.T. Read, who is being honored in nearly day long ceremonies for her numerous past accomplishments.

Spearheaded by the Flushing Masonic Lodge No. 298, the celebration will center on the awarding of the Community Builder's Award to Mrs. Read which is the highest award that can be bestowed on a non-Mason. In addition, Mrs. Read will also receive awards and commendations from nearly all community, business, and civic associations including keys to the city from the mayor and having June 2 proclaimed as Victoria C.T. Read Day. It is only appropriate, therefore, that I make you and my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives aware of the significant contributions that Mrs. Read has made to Flushing and the surrounding area in Belmont County, OH.

Born in Flushing in 1916, Mrs. Read attended the University of Akron and transferred to St. Thomas School of Nursing in Akron, OH from which she graduated as a registered nurse and where she later taught for a number of years. Her husband, Dr. Gerald H. Read, Ph.D. was a professor at Kent State University and distinguished himself in the field of international education. For over a quarter of a century, Dr. and Mrs. Read oversaw a pro-

gram of providing education in 40 different countries. Despite her exposure to the world and recognition for education everywhere, Mrs. Read never lost sight of her lifelong dream of a modern library facility in Flushing.

Understanding the great benefits that a properly furnished library can provide to a community and its people, Mrs. Read took it upon herself to provide such a facility to Flushing. Using her entire inheritance from her parents as seed money, she began a fundraising campaign in 1978 for a new library that would ultimately cost \$336,000. By 1983, the Flushing-Belmont County Library Foundation was established and with the money that was raised by the foundation, along with a grant provided by the State of Ohio Library Association, the official ground breaking took place on June 16, 1984, and the new facility was dedicated 9 months later and was debt free.

The paramount role that Mrs. Read played in the establishment of the library in Flushing is well known to all in the area. There is no question about the importance of her financial contributions, but just as important are her personal contributions in the way of her clear and compelling vision of what a public library can do for any community. This having been learned by the village of Flushing and the community is very appreciative of everything Mrs. Read has done for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occurrence today that we find those individuals with the kind of commitment and perseverance demonstrated by Mrs. Victoria Read. She serves as an inspiration to all of us to dedicate ourselves to those causes that truly make a difference in the lives of others.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I want to join with the entire Flushing community and express my gratitude and appreciation to Mrs. Victoria Read for all that she has done for the village and its past, current, and future residents.

THE MITCHELL H. COHEN UNITED
STATES COURTHOUSE

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that would designate the U.S. courthouse being constructed at 400 Cooper Street in Camden, NJ, as the "Mitchell H. Cohen United States Courthouse."

A dedicated public servant for over 50 years, Judge Mitchell Cohen has distinguished himself in the Camden community again and again. A graduate of the Dickinson School of Law, Mitchell Cohen quickly became involved in the Republican Party, eventually serving as the Republican leader of Camden City. The long list of public posts Mitch held begins with solicitor for Camden City Welfare Board and includes Camden City Prosecutor, Camden County Freeholder, municipal court judge, special deputy attorney general for New Jersey, judge of Camden County Court, and superior court judge. In August 1962, President Kennedy appointed Mitchell Cohen, judge of

the U.S. district court for the district of New Jersey, becoming chief judge in 1973, and finally serving as senior judge of the U.S. district court. Mitch was also temporarily assigned to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Philadelphia.

Outside of public office Mitch Cohen continued to serve the Camden area through his efforts in numerous civic and charitable organizations. His love of music and theater led Mitch to organize the Summer Park Tent Theater in the Round in the Camden County Park in Cherry Hill. He also traveled extensively in Italy, where in 1972, he was knighted by King Umberto II, and named a commendatore of the Crown of Italy. Wherever Mitch went, people recognized his enthusiasm and dedication to the life and livelihood of his community.

Therefore, it is no surprise that Mitchell Cohen has been honored with numerous awards from both his colleagues and countless other organizations. However, I believe the most fitting tribute to such a tireless servant of the Camden Community will be the naming of our new courthouse in his honor, where the work he dedicated his career to will continue to flourish for years to come.

EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE NOTED

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues, have taken the floor of this House from time to time to commend the work of those who serve in the National Guard. I rise today to call attention to the extra-curricular service performed by T. Sgt. John Key II of the Tennessee Air National Guard in behalf of a group of students from Richview Middle School in Clarksville, TN.

I think perhaps the best tribute is this letter, sent to me by a teacher at the school, Ann Long. I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as fitting tribute to the generous spirit of Technical Sergeant Key:

RICHVIEW MIDDLE SCHOOL,
Clarksville, TN, May 7, 1991.

Hon. DON SUNDQUIST,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HONORABLE SIR: I am a teacher at Richview Middle School in Clarksville, Tennessee. The purpose of my letter is to commend John Key, II, a parent of one of our sixth grade students.

Each year we take the entire sixth grade class on a week long trip to Golden Pond, Kentucky, Youth Station in the TVA Land Between the Lakes nature area. We ask parents to go as chaperones. This year TSGT Key offered his expertise as a parent volunteer. He conducted eight two hour training sessions. Mr. Key taught outdoor camping and rope skills. All of the teachers and volunteers were most impressed by Mr. Key's planning and execution of his class. Most of all the students gained useful information and enjoyed learning.

TSGT Key's Tennessee Air National Guard uniform prompted many questions about the guard. His answers to these questions may have sparked an interest in this branch of the service.

Mr. Key continued to be a big help with our night visuals. He pointed out nocturnal creatures such as deer, fox, bobcat, opossum, mink, skunk, beaver, raccoon, muskrat, and numerous other animals.

The last night in camp with the aid of his family TSGT Key planned and orchestrated a night hike through the woods. Using previously constructed burlap and tallow torches as light sources, he moved 130 people through the woods to the predetermined site. The bonfire program was most impressive.

Never have we seen anyone more dedicated to the job at hand! Mr. Key's presence at our outdoor educational trip and his devotion to motivating our students was exceptional. Our trip would have been lacking greatly if Mr. Key had not lent himself so wholeheartedly to our cause.

We wish to express our appreciation for Mr. Key. He is a great asset to our community and I am sure, to the Tennessee Air National Guard.

Again, thank you for allowing him to join us for the week.

Sincerely,

ANN LONG,
Outdoor Education Coordinator,
Richview Middle School.

WELCOMING CYPRIOT PRESIDENT
GEORGE VASSILIOU

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to welcome the President of the Republic of Cyprus to Washington and to the House Chamber this morning.

President Vassiliou took office during a difficult time for Cyprus. The occupation of the island by a foreign force was its 14th year and negotiations, while never totally dead, were at a near standstill. But President Vassiliou has brought renewed energy to the process of negotiating a settlement to the Cypriot situation and a settlement is again being actively pursued in the halls of government in Washington, Nicosia, Ankara, and at the United Nations.

President Vassiliou is largely responsible for the change in attitude toward the Cyprus dilemma. He is a natural conciliator. He brought together Cypriots from all parts of the political spectrum when he won the Presidency of Cyprus in 1988 without being affiliated to any political party. He won because the people of Cyprus believe in him and his message of reunification, of bringing all the people of Cyprus together.

We welcome President Vassiliou and wish him Godspeed in his work to reunify his homeland.

RUST VERSUS SULLIVAN

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Last week's Supreme Court ruling upholding the title X gag rule leaves no doubt as to where the Court is heading. The gag rule prevents health profes-

sionals from giving their patients full information about their medical options. It restricts a doctor's right to free speech and a client's right to information about legal medical procedures. Women need to know all their options in order to make a fully informed choice, and they should not be penalized for using a publicly funded facility.

The agencies affected by this ruling do not use Federal money to provide abortions. Their title X funds support family planning programs—precisely the services that help prevent abortions. It would be an unfortunate mistake to force agencies to lose title X money and hence cut family planning services, resulting in increased pregnancy and abortion rates.

I call my colleagues' attention to the following article published in the May 29, 1991, Washington Post. Judy Mann details the devastating effect this ruling will have on low-income women who depend on title X clinics for full and accurate information, and she describes the need for congressional action to protect against further erosion of the right to choose. She specifically points to the Freedom of Choice Act, H.R. 25, which would codify *Roe* versus *Wade* and protect a woman's right to choose. As the Supreme Court becomes increasingly out of step with the views of the American public, Congress must step in and protect these rights.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1991]

GAGGING WOMEN'S CLINICS

(By Judy Mann)

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling forbidding federally funded family planning clinics to give any advice about abortion underscores the foolishness with which this country is managing its reproductive policies, and should galvanize thoughtful men and women into political action.

The National Research Council issued a report this year that found that the United States, at one time a world leader in contraceptive research, had fallen two decades behind Europe. One of the results of that is that the United States has the highest teenage pregnancy rate in the world, one of the highest rates of unintended pregnancies and—predictably—one of the highest rates of abortion.

Abortion opponents, led by the Catholic Church and fundamentalists, two bastions of patriarchy, have cowed Congress and two successive Republican administrations into restricting access to abortions for poor women, women in the military service or Peace Corps as well as dependents of military and Peace Corps personnel, and women who are covered under federal government insurance programs. Women in prisons cannot get federally funded abortions, nor can Native American women whose health care is provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Women who continue to have relatively easy access to abortions are educated, middle-class white women who have private health insurance—and who are traditionally among the most reliable users of birth control. Women who are the least reliable users of birth control, and who are the least capable of taking care of their children economically, are among the groups whose access to abortion has systematically been eroded during the Reagan-Bush years.

These administrations have promoted births in some of the very groups most likely to end up on welfare: minorities, women who are not wed and teenage dropouts whose pregnancies are likely to lead to a lifetime of

marginal jobs and public dependency. They, along with rural women, are typical of the 5 million women who go to the 4,000 federally funded family planning clinics each year. Not to allow providers to tell these women that abortion is an option for an unwanted pregnancy is the kind of reverse social engineering one associates with the Ceausescu policies in Romania—but that is indeed what the Supreme Court, in last week's decision, has done.

And, in ruling that the government can control the content of any program getting federal funding, which is the net effect of the ruling, the court has given the government an unprecedented reach into the lives of everyone who comes into contact with a federal dollar. This, from a conservative court, molded by a Republican Party that campaigned against judicial activism?

If Congress can bar doctors from giving information about abortions to patients at clinics, surely it also can control the content of art that is funded by government grants, and surely it also can control the conversations that take place between legal aid lawyers and their clients. And it follows that it can control the content of university programs that receive federal funds. One of the more extraordinary passages of the ruling, written by Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, seemed designed to forestall this transgression. He wrote: "The university is a traditional sphere of free expression so fundamental to the functioning of our society that the government's ability to control speech," would be restricted by the First Amendment.

It was significant that Justice Sandra Day O'Connor dissented from the 5 to 4 decision. Only men who have never been pregnant could have come up with the lunatic belief that a school's right to free expression is more sacred than a woman's right to complete medical information.

Reps. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) and John Porter (R-Ill.) are sponsoring legislation that would allow providers in federally funded clinics to counsel women on all of their options, and to give referrals. It is expected to be voted on before the 30 days in which the gag order goes into effect.

Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.) is sponsoring the Freedom of Choice Act, which forbids states to enact laws that abridge a woman's right to abortion. This act codifies the 1973 Supreme Court ruling of *Roe v. Wade* that legalized abortion, and which abortion backers believe is the next target of the Supreme Court.

In the long run, men and women who want abortion to remain legal will have to look to Congress to pass this act, and to the White House for a president who will not veto it. There are an estimated 17 million women in this country who have had legal, safe abortions since 1973. Now is the time for them to speak out and to let Congress and the White House know that reproductive rights are every bit as sacred to them as freedom of speech is to a university.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE RAY RICHARD

HON. BUD CRAMER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to give tribute to a

resident of my district and a dear friend, Christine Ray Richard.

Mrs. Richard has compiled an incredible 199 volunteer service years in various Huntsville organizations. She is greatly loved and respected throughout the community and will be honored on May 29 by the local chapter of the Arthritis Foundation with their Humanitarian Award.

A native Mississippian, Mrs. Richard is married to Ludie G. Richard. They have one daughter, Diana Richard Jackson. Diana and her husband are the parents of a son, Will, age one.

Mrs. Richard and her husband moved to Huntsville in 1951. Shortly thereafter she began the years of volunteer service that have been the lifeblood of so many organizations.

For the past 31 years, Mrs. Richard has worked with the Girl Scouts. As a mother, she was a leader in Brownie, Junior, and Cadette levels. She originated and chaired the steering committee of the major Bicentennial project "Madison County Women's Scroll of Honor" and for 4 years was chairman of the Scroll of Honor Committee for the three awards presented biennially. She was selected as one of the National Bicentennial Girl Scouts' "Hidden Heroines" and was so honored in Washington, DC, in the Girl Scout Hall of Heroines. Mrs. Richard continues this involvement as a board member and most recently was the recipient of the "Thanks" badge, the highest award given an adult Scout member for service beyond the call of duty.

For 10 years Mrs. Richard taught Kindergarten Sunday School at the First United Methodist Church. She has served on the administrative board and as the joint chairman, along with Laura Hamilton, of the first CASA [Care Assurance System for the Aging] team at the church. Referrals were received by Christine, who secured volunteers to fill the need. So outstanding were her CASA contributions that she is now an honorary member of their board.

Mrs. Richard has made major contributions to the Huntsville branch of the American Association of University Women in the area of educational foundation programs. She was honored with an International Named Graduate Fellowship designated as the Christine Ray Richard Fellowship Award. She was the first person to receive the "Eve Award" twice for the greatest contribution to AAUW by a non-board member.

Mrs. Richard began her dedication to Randolph School 31 years ago when her daughter became one of the first students to enroll. Mrs. Richard originated more than \$250,000. She served as chairman for the dedication of the Sharon Barbour Rhett Fine Arts Center. She personally assumed the general chairmanship of the school's first nine annual giving programs as a member of the Board of Trustees. During that period over \$1,000,000 were raised, of which more than 90 percent was directed to the teachers' salaries and instructional materials. Also during her tenure an endowment program was established, now totaling over \$300,000. A capital giving drive for which she as Division Chairman was completed and raised over \$1,250,000. When Mrs. Richard reached her goal and continued to raise money for this effort, she, for significant

service and leadership, was honored when the Junior High Building was dedicated. To further honor her, the Board of Trustees named her, along with M. Louis Salmon, lifetime members.

The health and well-being of others have always been of paramount importance to Mrs. Richard. As an active member of the Mental Health Association and its board, Mrs. Richard was presented all three of its award certificates, including the highest, the Distinguished Service Award. Mrs. Richard was a founding member of the Huntsville Group Home for Girls, serving on its board of directors for 9 years. Although no longer in existence, it met a critical community need at the time. For 2 years Mrs. Richard has also been a dedicated member of the Huntsville Hospital Foundation Board.

Mrs. Richard is a longtime member of the board of the Community Ballet Association, serving as chairman of the Sixth Antebellum Garden Party which surpassed any previous fundraising total. She originated and helped establish the "Ballet Laureate Award" which recognizes individuals making outstanding contributions to the art of ballet. In 1984 Mrs. Richard was presented this award. She also serves on the advisory board of the Huntsville Art League.

In 1971 Mrs. Richard became a member of the Women's Guild of the Huntsville Museum of Art. Since that time she has logged over 6,000 volunteer hours. Her major contributions include joint chairman of the First Museum Birthday Party, joint chairman of the Second Decorators Showhouse (which tripled the profits of the first), newsletter editor, and joint chairman of "Scenes of the Holidays." She wrote the original job description for the museum employees for accreditation application. In 1989 Mrs. Richard was honored with the coveted Doris Darling Award.

Mrs. Richard has been active in the Huntsville Symphony Orchestra Guild since 1971. Through the years she has contributed thousands of dollars toward the orchestra's budget through solicitation of ticket sales and donations. She served as concert season membership chairman for three seasons. Her first year as chairman there was a complete sell-out for the opening of the Von Braun Civic Center. For 5 years she was top ticket seller for season memberships and received the first "Hall of Fame" award for her efforts. She was the first "Quarter Notes" newsletter editor. In 1974, Mrs. Richard helped organize the first Crescen-Dough Auction and served as its Acquisition position through 1977. She became joint chairman in 1979 and has served in many other capacities since that year. To this date, the auction has raised \$800,000.

Mrs. Richard was joint chairman of the first Dog Ball, organized to raise money for the Greater Huntsville Humane Society. Since its inception 2 years ago, the event has already realized \$25,000.

Mrs. Richard received the Virginia Hamill Simms Memorial Award in 1984. That same year she received the Governor's Arts Award.

Through all of her efforts, Mrs. Richard's husband, Ludie, has been unwavering in his support and deserves individual recognition for his generosity. Christine Ray Richard has devoted over 40 years to improving the quality of life in the Huntsville community. Her extraor-

dinary ability to raise tremendous sums of money, her continuous volunteer endeavors, and her benevolence and compassion make her a very special lady. I am most fortunate to have Mrs. Richard as a citizen of the Fifth District and am honored to call her a friend.

ETHIOPIAN JEWS RESCUED BY AIRLIFT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the airlift of Ethiopia's Jewish community last Friday to Israel, on the heels of a rebel takeover of Addis Ababa, is both historic and gratifying. "Operation Solomon" succeeded in bringing nearly 15,000 of Ethiopian Jews—Beta Israel—to Israel during a 36-hour period in a massive shuttle of Israeli aircraft flying directly between those two nations. As cochairman of the Congressional Ad Hoc Caucus for Ethiopian Jews, I want to commend all those involved in this rescue for a job well done.

In 1984 and 1985, Operations Moses and Joshua evacuated thousands of Ethiopian Jews from refugee camps in the Sudan, although disclosure of the flights brought about their suspension. In the 6 years which followed, the Beta Israel endured a great deal. Deprivation and discrimination, disease and despair were all too commonplace. Most distressing though, families were split, with children separated from parents, and couples separated from each other. Our goal was to try to reunite the Ethiopian Jewish community in Israel; something the community had long prayed for.

Operation Solomon succeeded in airlifting the many thousands of Beta Israel who made the trek from the Ethiopian Gondar region to the Ethiopian capital of Addis Ababa last summer. Although several thousand remain stranded in the Gondar region at this time, their swift emigration is also one of our highest priorities, and will hopefully be completed quickly.

As one of the cochairmen of the Congressional Caucus for Ethiopian Jews, I can assure my colleagues that this historic redemption is due to the dedication and devotion to the highest principles of human rights on the part of many individuals. Under President Bush's leadership, the State Department, well represented by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Hank Cohen, made great inroads in convincing the Mengistu regime of the need to allow the Beta Israel to emigrate. This position was enhanced and strengthened by the intervention of former Senator Rudy Boschwitz, one of our caucus' Senate cochair and as President Bush's personal envoy, who made the crumbling Ethiopian government realize the high priority the United States placed on the emigration of the Beta Israel.

The Government of Israel is indeed to be commended for its heroic efforts and pinpoint logistical implementation of the airlift of this proud remnant of Ethiopian Jewry. Following the resumption of diplomatic relations between Ethiopia and Israel in the fall of 1989, discus-

sions focused on increasing the number of Beta Israel allowed to reunify with family members in Israel. Bureaucratic requirements, delays, and excuses limited the number of emigres to several hundred per month.

Last summer, flights were discontinued for no concrete reason, and again this past February. Although flights started up once more following strong criticism from the United States, and which were authorized to transport approximately 1,000 Beta Israel to Israel per month, the forward progress made by rebel groups and the threat to the security of the Beta Israel caused the Congressional Caucus for Ethiopian Jews to make an emergency appeal to Secretary of State Baker urging support for a massive airlift. Subsequently there was a positive response and negotiations intensified. A plan of action was implemented quickly after a letter sent by President Bush was delivered to the Ethiopian Government on the day of Mengistu's resignation and flight to Zimbabwe.

Mr. Speaker, the significant contribution of the American Association for Ethiopian Jews also needs to be noted. Their tireless efforts in promoting rescue and relief on a shoestring budget, as well as alerting others that thousands remained in Ethiopia following Operations Moses and Joshua, assisted the Congressional Caucus for Ethiopian Jews in increasing awareness among Members of Congress, thereby expanding caucus membership and allowing us to advocate on behalf of this threatened Jewish community. No stone was left unturned by the caucus in its effort to bring about this momentous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most gratifying of all is the miracle of the birth of 10 babies during this rescue. Their life in Israel will be far more enriching than the Diaspora their parents knew. Though Israel's capacity to provide absorption assistance has been strained beyond measure in recent months, the Beta Israel will receive all the love and attention that the country can bestow. Accordingly, with God's help, their dream of reaching Jerusalem has finally been fulfilled. For this we are all indeed thankful.

TRAINING AMERICA'S FUTURE WORKERS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, for years now our colleague BILL FORD of Michigan has told the Members of this body that our country must make education and training an urgent priority. Chairman FORD has made the case that the jobs of the future are going to be dramatically different than yesterday's jobs—or even today's.

It's going to take an all-out effort to ensure that America's future workers get the skills and the training to compete in the global markets of the future. David Broder in the article I submit for today's RECORD, makes clear that because of BILL FORD's efforts, America is beginning to understand its greatest challenge.

Most issues that come before this body will be molded by the ability of our work force to compete. Education and training are the new lifeline for America—and we are fortunate that Chairman FORD's message is finally starting to sink in.

BLUE-COLLAR JOBS, BLUE-CHIP SKILLS
(By David S. Broder)

As chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Rep. William D. Ford, D-Mich., presides over a committee of 34 members, a staff three times that size and an agenda that reaches into every school, college, factory and business office in the nation.

But back in Ypsilanti, he remarked the other day, when he stops in his favorite tavern to swap talk, "It's not 'Mr. Chairman,' it's 'Hey, Billy, what the hell ya gonna do about' whatever's on their mind."

What is mostly on their minds these days is where the jobs have gone—and how the jobs have changed.

"In the old days," the 63-year-old Ford recalled, "all a kid had to do was stay out of jail until he was 18, and then he'd hear at the pool hall or wherever one day. 'They're hiring by Chrysler'—that's how they said it. And he'd get a job on the line at Chrysler or GM or Ford, and in two years he'd be making enough to get married and buy a house. That's how it worked, and it's how my district was built up. Now, to be an entry-level steelworker, you've got to pass an exam in math and general science. The simple jobs are gone."

More than any other single question, the challenge of educating and training the work force for the new economy will determine what kind of future America has—or whether it really has a future.

With Senate education matters in the hands of the patrician Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., and the born-to-wealth Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., it is well that somebody with the blue-collar, assembly-line, bleachers-and-beer perspective of a Billy Ford also has a large voice in these policy decisions. If there really is to be reform of education in this country, it will more likely be driven by the demands of business and the needs of workers than any other force.

What Ford has seen firsthand is captured in broader terms in two recent reports. One is the publication called "America and the New Economy," prepared by Anthony P. Carnevale, chief economist of the American Society for Training and Development, on contract to the Department of Labor. The other is the cover story on the June 3 issue of Fortune magazine, titled "Brainpower: How Intellectual Capital Is Becoming America's Most Valuable Asset."

The lesson in both articles is that from now on, America, like any other advanced nation, will increasingly have to think its way to prosperity. Thomas A. Stewart, the author of the Fortune article, quotes Dr. P. Roy Vagelos, head of Merck & Co., the pharmaceutical firm: "A low-value product can be made by anyone anywhere. When you have knowledge no one else has access to—that's dynamite."

It's easy to see that lesson demonstrated in the chemistry laboratory or a lawyer's office or in the showroom of a fashion designer. But Carnevale's report backs up Ford's contention that even the most basic blue-collar jobs are changing.

"The challenge to manufacturing skill in the new economy," Carnevale writes, "is not so much to make the widget, but to make it with quality and variety, to tailor it for the

consumer, to deliver state-of-the-art versions of the widget fast and conveniently in a complex global economy, and to win the race up the learning curve to improve the widget. The labor and skill involved in these processes have less and less to do with hands-on production."

By way of illustration, Ford talks of a new "slotting and shearing" plant in his district where 300,000 tons of steel are shaped into automotive fenders each year by 38 employees. "Nobody touches the steel," he said. "All they do is handle computers."

As repetitive physical labor with materials is reduced, the new work requires people who can deal with abstractions (often symbolically presented on computer screens) and who can, at the same time, work effectively with suppliers, customers and others in the same firm. It takes people who are comfortable dealing with unexpected changes in routine and who have the skill and self-confidence to change their own work patterns.

Employers have been quicker than teachers, principals, school boards or even young people to recognize the changing nature of work and to raise their hiring standards accordingly. "The biggest difficulty," Ford remarked, "is getting young people to understand that jobs require more than a high school education."

That is where the issue of social equity enters. Carnevale puts it in stark terms. "The United States excels at educating white-collar and technical elites," he writes, "while the non-college-bound receive second-rate educations, no applied learning and relatively little responsibility or opportunity to develop on the job."

"About one in every five college graduates gets some training from an employer, but only one in 13 employees without college gets training." The inevitable effect of this pattern is that those who start ahead of the pack, in educational terms, move further ahead, while those with lesser educational backgrounds fall further behind. What is true of the population as a whole is especially true for minorities—adding a racial gulf to the growing class barriers.

All this poses the greatest challenge, not just to Bill Ford, but to America.

WE NEED TO REPEAL UNFAIR 10-PERCENT FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON BOATS

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to repeal the new Federal excise tax on certain boats. I do so because rather than raise significant amounts of Federal revenues, as originally intended, this tax is putting ordinary workers out of their jobs.

As part of last year's budget agreement, the 101st Congress adopted a deficit reduction package that created a 10-percent excise tax on boats that cost more than \$100,000. The goal of this tax was to ensure that wealthy taxpayers contribute their fair share of taxes. However, while that may have been the hope, the practical reality of the new excise tax on boats has turned out far differently and for Maine workers far more harshly.

Instead of raising revenues from the rich, this tax is putting low-income and middle-in-

come, highly skilled workers out of jobs because the boat manufacturing industry in Maine is simply not selling any boats. Consequently, the Federal Government is not getting any revenues and instead is facing the prospect of higher spending levels due to the increased unemployment resulting from this tax.

At a recent town meeting I held in Ellsworth during the Easter recess I met with more than 50 people who are employed by boat building companies. They expressed to me their very serious concerns about this new 10-percent excise tax is devastating their industry.

For example, 1 Maine recreational boat manufacturer has just laid-off 15 employees and the company's remaining 135 employees have agreed to a 10-percent pay cut. This same company has received only one request to build a boat in 1991 but this was only after the company agreed to pay the 10-percent excise itself. Another boat manufacturer in Maine has recently filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy protection.

Many of the workers at my town meeting explained that the domestic boat manufacturing has been enduring a recession of its own for the past 2 years. According to the National Marine Manufacturers Association [NMMA] for example, nationwide sales of recreational boats have declined more than 40 percent over the past 2 years and employment in the industry has declined from roughly 600,000 to approximately 400,000.

As most people already know the overall economy in Maine and New England has itself been in a recession. So on top of all that, this new excise tax is clearly making a difficult situation even worse.

In Maine, many boat manufacturers are small, family-owned businesses that have been in operation for generations. In coastal towns building boats is a way of life, not simply a 9-to-5 job.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation's estimates the 10 percent boat tax is expected to raise only \$3 million in revenues during fiscal year 1991. Given that such a small amount of Federal taxes are expected to be raised by this tax, is the loss of the domestic boat manufacturing industry and the consequent increased unemployment requiring higher Federal spending and lower Federal revenues worth keeping this new tax on the books? I don't believe it is and as a result, I am sponsoring this bill today to repeal this tax.

In order to ensure that the passage and enactment of such a measure is deficit-neutral, my bill also repeals provisions included in last year's budget agreement that expanded the depletion allowance for oil and gas producers.

With the 10-percent Federal tax on some boats putting everyday workers out of jobs it doesn't seem fair that the Congress should be in the business of expanding tax shelters and loopholes for the oil and gas industry, which has traditionally enjoyed lenient treatment by the Federal Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues in the House to join with me in supporting efforts to repeal the 10-percent tax on boats.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 and 21, I was unavoidably absent during regular House business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the following rollcall votes:

Rollcall No. 96.

Rollcall No. 102.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the following rollcall votes:

Rollcall No. 97.

Rollcall No. 98.

Rollcall No. 100.

Rollcall No. 101.

Rollcall No. 103.

**MRS. FANNY JACKSON
CELEBRATES 110TH BIRTHDAY**

HON. CLAUDE HARRIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, to say that Fanny Jackson, of Greene County, AL has lived a full life is undoubtedly an understatement. Growing up in rural Alabama, Mrs. Jackson has seen the changing of the South of the old to one of social integration and economic prosperity.

Celebrating her 110th year Mrs. Jackson is still able to recall her difficult childhood of working in the cotton fields, which kept her out of school. Despite this, Mrs. Jackson shows no signs of anger toward society. On the contrary, she chooses to show only love toward others as "Jesus taught us," she says. Although doctors have urged her to slow down her activities, she refuses to let that keep her out of church and church-related functions which have meant so much to her throughout her life.

When asked to list what she believes has given her such a long life, she says, "The Good Lord, good conditioning, hard work, and obedience." If this is so they may be things for us all to live by.

Happy birthday, Mrs. Jackson.

**SOUTH FLORIDA CELEBRATES
NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK**

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize BASE [Boaters Action for a Safe Environment], south Florida, and the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary for playing a leading role in promoting National Safe Boating Week, June 2 through June 8 this year in south Florida.

One of the leading events of this important week will be the National Safe Boating Festival.

Over 40,000 visitors are expected to visit the festival in Miami's Bayside Marketplace, Marina, and Miami Bayfront Park. The festival will promote community awareness about safe boating and the environment through many exhibits including fire and rescue demonstrations and a manatee touching pool.

National Safe Boating Week is the annual national media event that launches the recreational boating season. It not only starts the traditional boating season but introduces a year-long media campaign to provide boaters more information about their sport.

This week is of special significance to south Florida which has one of the largest recreational boating populations in the world serving both the local community as well as many visitors. South Florida's boating industry also produces a wide variety of products ranging from canoes and personal watercraft to speed boats and yachts. South Florida's growing marine traffic has further emphasized the need for boating safety not only to protect human life but also to protect our marine life.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank BASE, south Florida, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, and the Dade County National Safe Boating Council for their work in promoting boating safety and environmental awareness.

Among the many Miami area residents who should be recognized for their help in promoting National Safe Boating Week are Dade County Commissioner Harvey Ruvin, C.J. Ortiz de Valderrama, Joseph Tenhagen, Peter Concepcion, Marion Liley, Joel Aberbach, Jonas Lappert, Shirley Sandberg, Alfonso Valdez, Miami City Commissioner J.L. Plummer, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard Ensign Andrea Palermo, Mario Artecona, James Burke, Roger Carlton, Marcia Fernandez, Mauricio Figueras, Mary Finian, William Franco, Captain John Gonzales, William P. Harrington, Martha A. Hoskins, Barry Kutun, Florida Marine Patrol Captain Mike Lamphear, Bob Levy, Dr. Susan Markley, Jackie Menendez, John Pezzulla, Frank Simokaitis, Donald Slesnick, Meredith Stark, M. Berman Stein, and Nicholas P. Valeriani.

**EMERGENCY AIRLIFT OF
ETHIOPIAN JEWS**

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to comment on the successful conclusion of the emergency airlift of 14,500 Ethiopian Jews to Israel over this past weekend. I have long been aware of the special plight of the Ethiopian Jews and as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Ethiopian Jewry, I have strongly supported efforts to secure their right to emigrate from Ethiopia to Israel. I am extremely heartened to see this goal realized.

Fortunately today the Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee of which I am a member, approved \$80 million to assist Israel in resettling refugees, an increase of \$35 million from last year. For those of us in Congress who have worked to free Jewry around

the globe these developments are deeply rewarding.

The struggle to complete the safe evacuation of Ethiopian Jews to Israel has been a long and arduous one. It was in 1973 that the Israeli government traced the history of the Ethiopian Jews to biblical times and sanctioned their right to immigrate to Israel. In 1984 Israel completed a secret airlift of 16,000 Ethiopian Jews and approximately 8,000 others were brought to Israel during the past 2 years. When the Ethiopian government barred any further departures for political reasons, thousands remained.

Fortunately, this past weekend the Ethiopian government allowed those who remained to emigrate to Israel. The subsequent evacuation was a remarkable logistical achievement. Approximately 35 civilian and military airplanes airlifted 14,500 Ethiopians over 1,500 miles in just under 36 hours. I should like to congratulate the Israeli government on this accomplishment. I also wish to take this opportunity to commend President Bush for his personal intervention in securing the right of Ethiopian Jews to emigrate to Israel. I know the President has long been concerned with this issue and his last minute communications to the government of Ethiopia proved invaluable in achieving the necessary conditions for the emergency airlift to occur.

In closing, for those Ethiopian Jews who have newly arrived in Israel I commend them for their perseverance and I wish them a successful and complete life in their new homeland. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my deep and sincere desire for peace to reach all the citizens of Ethiopia who have for so long suffered repression and hardship. The international community must now make every effort to bring peace and security to that nation's citizens.

**THE IONA PREPARATORY SCHOOL:
75 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE**

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues a noteworthy occasion. Friday marks the beginning of the Iona Preparatory School's 75th Jubilee, a time for both reflection and celebration.

Since 1916, Iona Prep has provided excellent educational opportunities to boys throughout Westchester County. The school has continually grown and prospered, and its students have excelled. In recent years, Iona Prep students have been earning test scores that are well above State and National averages, and they are being accepted into some of the best colleges and universities in the Nation. A remarkable number have been National Merit Scholarship finalists and commended students, and a great many have earned New York State Regents Scholarships. At every level, it is clear that Iona Prep students receive a top-notch education.

Iona Prep strives to provide its students with a well-rounded education that goes beyond

traditional academics. There are a wide range of clubs and activities available to the students, and their athletic teams have excelled against tough competition in many sports. The school also works to ensure that its students have career experience through a very well designed internship program. Most importantly, the Christian Brothers who run Iona Prep work diligently to instill in their students the values and character traits that will make them successful in all aspects of their lives.

I am proud to represent Iona Prep. It is a school with a tradition of excellence and an inspiring record of achievement. I am sure that all of my colleagues join me in wishing the students, faculty, administration, alumni, and friends of this exceptional school our most sincere congratulations at this momentous time. I am confident that they will move forward to a future that builds on its superb tradition. Iona Prep will continue to produce for our community and the Nation exemplary students and fine citizens.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH
ANNIVERSARY OF EAST SIDE
HOUSE SETTLEMENT

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you and my distinguished colleagues the celebration of 100 years of public and community service of a venerable organization in New York, the East Side House Settlement.

Mr. Speaker, in 1890 Everett P. Wheeler observed the plight of the impoverished immigrants living in the Upper East Side of New York City, and he reminded his fellow members of the Church Club of the Episcopal Church of New York that the church's mission was to help the poor and the disadvantaged. He proposed to them that the church establish and underwrite what became the first early settlement houses where social workers, privileged by opportunity and education, "settled" among those they wished to help, believing that by living and working together with the residents, they could build a better community. East Side House was incorporated in 1891, and the early board of managers included figures such as J.P. Morgan and Cornelius Vanderbilt.

Through 2 world wars, the Great Depression, and financial problems, the settlement persevered and continues today to fulfill its original mission of community and public service to the poor and uneducated. In 1961, the house's board of managers moved the settlement from Manhattan's Yorkville community to my district, the South Bronx, often referred to as one of the poorest districts in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, today, East Side House is a vital community institution which continues to promote ideals of courage, determination, imagination, and belief in the strength of the human spirit. East Side House has flourished and reached out to thousands of poor and homeless because its programs respond to specific community concerns and needs, and

encourage community residents to break the poverty cycle. East Side House is dedicated to providing a variety of comprehensive services for community members of all ages. These programs focus on motivating young people to confront the challenges of life in the South Bronx, and to take responsibility for the future of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to describe to you and my colleagues some of the successful programs which East Side House offers. The afterschool program provides 400 children with daily educational, recreational, and cultural programs that empower them with the extra support and preparation they need to succeed in school. East Side House was selected by the United Way as one of three demonstration sites for the Community Based Drug Prevention Initiative. This program will mobilize the entire community with the specific goal of keeping adolescents away from drugs. The Educational Services Program is a young adult literacy program for high school drop-outs. In the past 12 months, 41 young adults have earned their GED, 28 have enrolled in a vocational training program, 28 have obtained full-time employment, and 12 have enrolled in college.

And when the Congressional Award Foundation chose my district for its first inner city chapter last year, East Side House, with its outstanding record, was the natural choice for the foundation's chapter headquarters.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating East Side House on 100 years of helping residents help themselves build a better life. The problems confronting all of New York City and many of the larger cities in our Nation—crime, drugs, AIDS, homelessness, and illiteracy are intensified in the South Bronx by extreme poverty and deprivation. East Side House continues to effectively address these problems with innovative and successful programs. It is with great pride that I share this tribute with you on this centennial celebration of the East Side House Settlement.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS
GRADUATES OF ARMED FORCES
ACADEMIES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to eight outstanding young men and women from my district in Michigan. These outstanding young people are graduating from the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy. The graduates are as follows:

Ms. Dawn Dishner is graduating from the Air Force Academy and will receive her commission as a second lieutenant. Second Lieutenant Dishner graduated from Carman-Ainsworth High School in June 1987, and entered the Air Force Academy in the summer of 1987. I am certain that Second Lieutenant Dishner will excel at all she attempts and will serve her country well.

Mr. Thomas Jahn is also graduating from the Air Force Academy and will receive his commission as a second lieutenant. Second Lieutenant Jahn graduated from Luke M. Powers Catholic High School in June 1987, and entered the Air Force Academy in the summer of 1987. He has excelled while attending the Air Force Academy and has been held in the highest esteem by his classmates and instructors.

Mr. Bradley Kinslow is graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and will receive his commission as either an ensign in the U.S. Navy or a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps. Bradley attended Grand Blanc High School, graduating in June 1987, and entered the Naval Academy in the summer of 1987. Bradley comes from a strong military background in his family and I am sure he will continue the superb service to his country.

Ms. Sherre Maclin is graduating from the U.S. Air Force Academy and will receive her commission as a second lieutenant. Second Lieutenant Maclin graduated from Luke M. Powers Catholic High School in 1987, and entered the Air Force Preparatory School in the summer of 1987. Second Lieutenant Maclin was then appointed to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. John Maxwell is graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and will receive his commission as either an ensign in the U.S. Navy or a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps. John attended Brandon High School, graduating in June 1987, and entered the Naval Academy in the summer of 1987. John has distinguished himself through his academic achievements while attending the Naval Academy.

Mr. John Miner is graduating from the U.S. Air Force Academy and will receive his commission as a second lieutenant. John graduated from Luke M. Powers Catholic High School in 1987, and entered the Air Force Academy in the summer of 1987. Second Lieutenant Miner was named to the commandant's list for academic achievement. This signifies academic excellence at the Air Force Academy and placed Second Lieutenant Miner in a most select group of cadets.

Mr. Kevin Williams is graduating from the U.S. Military Academy and will receive his commission as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Second Lieutenant Williams graduated from Davison High School in 1987, and entered the Military Academy in the summer of 1987. Second Lieutenant Williams has distinguished himself during his career at the Military Academy and will continue to excel and serve his country well.

Mr. Daniel Morley is also graduating from the U.S. Military Academy and will receive his commission as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Second Lieutenant Morley graduated from Luke M. Powers Catholic High School in 1986, and entered the Military Academy in the summer of 1987. Second Lieutenant Morley has continued the tradition of excellence and will serve his country well.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to rise today to pay tribute to these future leaders of our great Nation. I am proud of the accomplishments of each of these graduates and it gives me a feeling of

security and confidence that they will lead our Nation into the next century.

CREIGHTON BLUEJAYS MAKE THE NCAA COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

HON. PETER HOAGLAND

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Creighton University Bluejays Baseball team and to congratulate the Bluejays for making the eight-team field of the NCAA College World Series held annually in Omaha. My wife, Barbara, a Creighton Law graduate, joins me in this tribute. For the past 42 years, Creighton has served as host school for the NCAA College World Series, but the Bluejays have never played in the national championship. This marks only the third time that Creighton has qualified for the NCAA tournament. This will be the first time that Omaha has had the opportunity to root for the home team. Even more special for the community is the fact that 7 players on the Creighton baseball team are natives of Omaha.

I also want to commend Head Coach and Assistant Athletic Director Jim Hendry, who is in his seventh year as head coach. Coach Hendry was hired as the youngest college head baseball coach in the country. He has built a fine program, starting from scratch, achieving national prominence in only a few short years.

Creighton swept the West I Regional at Los Angeles by defeating Hawaii 15-8 in the championship game. Third baseman Scott Stahoviak was named the regional's most outstanding player. Adding to the excitement, Creighton led the Nation in batting with a .360 team average this season. The Bluejays also set a team record for victories in a season with a 49-20 record.

The Creighton campus is only 4 miles from Rosenblatt Stadium, site of the college world series.

The entire Omaha community is very proud of the Bluejays. We will all be following the series closely. My colleagues here in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Creighton team and wishing them much success in the national championship tournament.

IN TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS K. UDALL

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my many colleagues who have addressed the House over the past few weeks to honor and pay tribute to Representative Mo Udall, who resigned from the House for health reasons on May 4.

Syndicated columnist Mark Shields may have summed it up best in describing Mo:

"[He] has been a gentle giant with laughter in his soul and integrity in his bones."

Indeed, Mo Udall was a giant among us. As chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he pushed through major legislation affecting the national park system, nuclear waste, and wilderness preservation. He was responsible for far-reaching campaign finance regulation in 1974, and as a loyal advocate for the miners and ranchers of his Arizona constituency, he guided such undertakings as the central Arizona project and the Phoenix outer loop.

But Mo does not shine simply because of his legislative accomplishments; he shines because of the optimism and strength of spirit which he brought to this House. His rare combination of humor and humility serves as an example to all of us, for his dynamic, light-hearted personality never detracted from his honesty and dedication to public service.

Even while struggling against his illness, Mo has never lost the fiery wit and perseverance for which he is so admired. Overcoming the challenge of his own personal battle, Mo continued to serve his district and his country for many years. Now, though he must take a rest from the work to which he is so devoted, his integrity and his love of life remain with us. His contribution is ongoing.

We thank Mo Udall for his leadership and honesty, for his humor and inspiration. We pray for his health and happiness during his retirement years. He will be greatly missed.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, each May, the law enforcement community of the Nation comes together in Washington to honor and commemorate the police officers who lost their lives in the preceding year while upholding public safety. May 15, 1991, marked the 10th anniversary of National Peace Officers' Memorial Day.

Over the past 10 years, ceremonies have been held at various spots on the Mall—between the U.S. Capitol Building and the Washington Monument. However, next year's ceremony will likely take place at the new Law Enforcement Officers Memorial which is nearing completion at Judiciary Square. Over 12,000 names of slain law enforcement officers will be enshrined at the new national memorial.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not recognize the special work of the National Fraternal Order of Police [FOP]—the sponsor of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service—whose headquarters are based in the district I am privileged to serve, Louisville and Jefferson County, KY.

I commend the work of national FOP president, Dewey Stokes, Kentucky FOP president, Ralph Orms, and Sharon Frank, the editor of the Kentucky FOP's publication, Knight Beat. Their professionalism and care in planning the peace officers' memorial service are appreciated by all who attend.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget members of the law enforcement community who have lost their lives while protecting ours. This is why National Peace Officers' Memorial Day is such an important occasion in Washington.

TRIBUTE TO A "RED HELMET"

HON. PETE GEREN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Fire Department's "Red Helmets" are people who spend their days and nights providing canteen service and food to the city's heroic firefighters. The members of the "Red Helmets" exemplify commitment, dedication, humble voluntarism, and giving without asking. These are also the qualities that make up Walter E. Hamilton, a retired member of the "Red Helmets" and a life-long educator of fire-safety.

As a General Services Administration fire inspector, Walter Hamilton has dedicated his life to protecting others from the ravages of fire. But he has done much more. He has taught others to protect themselves.

Through his program, "The Magic of Fire," Walter Hamilton has unselfishly given his free time to bring life-saving fire safety information to the people of Fort Worth. We will never know how many children will grow to be adults because of the work he did or how many fathers and mothers will be around to love their children because of something they learned from Walter Hamilton. But if his work has given the gift of life to just one, then there is no greater gift he could have given to the people of Fort Worth.

He is retired from the "Red Helmets" now, but he continues to give his free time to aid Fort Worth firefighters, never asking for anything in return. We can all learn a little something from Walter Hamilton, if not about fire-safety, then about the true meaning of public service.

Walter Hamilton can now do something that few of us can. He can look back on his life and know that he will always live on as a symbol of the spirit of the "Red Helmets."

A TRIBUTE TO MARLA GIBBS AND TOYOTA

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, when most of us think of actress Marla Gibbs, we think about her portrayal of Mary Jenkins in the hit television series "227." In her role as Mary, Miss Gibbs brought extreme joy to all who were lucky enough to view the program.

Mr. Speaker, the professional accomplishments of Marla Gibbs are quite numerous. They include Emmy Awards from 1981 through 1985 for best supporting actress, seven-time recipient of the NAACP Image Award as best actress in a comedy series and

special awards of merit from the Black Women in Theatre-West and Southern California Motion Picture Council.

Aside from being a force in the world of drama, Marla is a giant when it comes to helping others improve their quality of life. Because of this commitment, Ms. Gibbs was the recipient of the "Hearts at Work" Award given by the volunteer centers of Los Angeles and South Bay-Harbor Long Beach.

The volunteer centers of Los Angeles and South Bay-Harbor Long Beach combine every year to recognize corporate and employee volunteer efforts. Joining Marla Gibbs as a recipient of the "Hearts at Work" Award is Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A. I hope that Marla and Toyota will continue to provide outstanding service to the community and Nation.

Marla Gibbs and Toyota deserve the "Hearts at Work" Award. Let us hope that their hearts continue to pump positive rebuilding energy into the collective body that we call community.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD A.
ZAWISLAK

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Richard A. Zawislak of Troop 6 in Cranston, and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 Merit Badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as Citizenship in the Community, Citizenship in the Nation, Citizenship in the World, Safety, Environmental Science, and First Aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. These young men have distinguished themselves in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Richard Zawislak led a group of Scouts in providing holiday season entertainment to clients at the Cedar Crest Nursing Home in Cranston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Richard Zawislak. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its eighty years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Richard Zawislak will continue his public service and in so doing

will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I am proud that Richard Zawislak undertook his Scout activity in my Representative District, and I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

THE MEDICAID FAMILY CARE ACT

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Not too long ago, I visited a hospital in Pennsylvania where I saw infants who had been born addicted to crack cocaine. This hospital has established an innovative program to reduce the number of drug-addicted babies by providing support programs for at-risk mothers. I was told, however, that one of the biggest obstacles to the success of this program is the lack of residential drug treatment centers for pregnant women with children. As many as 80 percent of the substance abuse treatment programs in this country refuse to treat crack-addicted pregnant women. Even a higher proportion of residential drug treatment programs refuse to accept pregnant women with their other dependent children.

Each year an estimated 375,000 infants are born exposed to drugs. We now know that fetal drug exposure can lead to severe learning disabilities and socialization problems. Even in the hospital, these drug-exposed infants demonstrated an inability to bond. By depriving drug treatment to pregnant women, we destroy not only their life but that of their unborn child.

The State of Pennsylvania has begun a statewide project to provide residential drug treatment programs for pregnant women and their children. This project, however, will only provide service to a small number of the women desperately in need of its assistance.

For these reasons, with my colleague from New York [Mr. TOWNS] I am introducing the Medicaid Family Care Act. This program will allow States the option of receiving Medicaid reimbursement for drug treatment programs for pregnant women and their children. This will allow the program in Pennsylvania to serve more women and for other States to begin programs of their own. For the future of this Nation, drug treatment programs must be available to pregnant women with their children.

LEUKEMIA BENEFIT TO HONOR
CAROL CICHOWSKI

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to an individual whose efforts, strength, and dedication are being honored by the Leukemia Society. Carol Cichowski is being honored because she exemplifies a life of service to others, a life cen-

tered on unbridled determination and a capacity to take on many tasks and succeed in doing so.

In 1974 Carol began her work with the Leukemia Society, and exhibited her adeptness when she held the successful Cut-a-thon to collect funds for patient-aid and research to help combat Leukemia. Her talents have also been demonstrated in her role as chairman of many Celebrity Waiter nights held in Worcester County, consequently, the most productive one was held in Webster's Colonial Restaurant.

Carol Cichowski has been a driving force in the community. In addition to her work for the Leukemia Society she sits on the board of the Hubbard Regional Hospital Guild, is a member of the Auxiliary for Polish American Veterans, does fundraising for the Advancement of Retarded Children, and has devoted time for fundraising events in the political arena. All of this she has done in addition to running her own business, Carol's Beauty Salon. She and her husband Joe, have also raised four daughters and are now the proud grandparents to Christopher and Jesse.

It is with great pride and respect that I honor Carol Cichowski today. Her courage and resilience is admirable. I am sure that like us all, Carol's life has been marked by great joy as well as by great sorrow, however Carol has put her energies and her talents into the many causes she believes in. I am proud that Carol Cichowski hails from my district and I want to personally thank Carol for all her efforts to help others in the area.

SALUTE TO THE FREE CLINIC OF
SIMI VALLEY

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an institution in my hometown of Simi Valley, CA—the Free Clinic.

Now celebrating its 20th year of providing medical, counseling and legal services to needy area residents, the volunteer staff at the Free Clinic has served more than 18,000 people.

The physicians, nurses, attorneys, counselors and just plain volunteers who have given so freely of their time have made a positive difference in the lives of many people—including their own. The Free Clinic is truly a bright point of light in the firmament of American volunteerism and our traditional concern for our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, on June 1, the Free Clinic will celebrate 20 years of benefiting its community. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the Free Clinic's accomplishments, and in wishing it well for many more years of service.

ST. PAUL FLOOD CONTROL
PROJECT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Mr. BEVILL, for his leadership and for his subcommittee's work on this year's energy and water appropriations bill.

I am particularly pleased that once again, the subcommittee has appreciated the significance of the St. Paul flood control project in St. Paul, MN. The Appropriations Committee has approved \$3 million for continuing construction on this important project, which is the cornerstone of the revitalization of the Mississippi River in downtown St. Paul.

These funds, along with the local match which was approved earlier this year by the St. Paul City Council and signed by Mayor Jim Scheibel, will be used to provide greater flood protection, the upgrading of the Harriet Island Small Boat Harbor, and the rejuvenation of low-lying land on the west side of the river. The work will be done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Over the past 5 years, Chairman BEVILL has been instrumental in the approval of approximately \$1.8 million for the St. Paul flood control project. I know that the people of St. Paul sincerely appreciate Chairman BEVILL's support for this project which is vital to the economic revitalization of the St. Paul riverfront.

TRIBUTE TO COL. GEORGE M.
BROOKE, USMC

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my deepest thanks to Col. George M. Brooke III, of the U.S. Marine Corps. Colonel Brooke is the outgoing commanding officer of the 1st Marine Corps District, Garden City, NY, and will be honored at a change-of-command ceremony on May 31, 1991.

Colonel Brooke was born in Augusta, GA, on February 12, 1945. He graduated from the Virginia Military Institute in June 1967, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps Reserve. Following additional specialized training at Quantico, VA, and Fort Sill, OK, George Brooke was transferred to the Republic of Vietnam where he served as an artillery forward observer with the 3d Battalion, 7th Marines; a fire direction officer with the 3d Battalion, 11th Marines; and platoon executive officer with the 3d 8-inch Howitzer Battery. His service in Southeast Asia was from May 1968 to June 1969, during which time he augmented into the regular Marine Corps.

Colonel Brooke has honorably and ably served his country at a variety of posts around the world since his return from Vietnam. He is a graduate of the Marine Corps Command and Staff College as well as the National War

College. His personal decorations include the Purple Heart Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Navy Commendation Medal with Combat "V," and one gold star, the Navy Achievement Medal, and the Combat Action Ribbon.

Colonel Brooke first came to my attention in June 1986, when he was transferred to the 1st Marine Corps District which is based in Garden City, a community adjacent to my district. He was initially assigned for duty as the assistant director for personnel procurement and was reassigned as the deputy director in September 1987. Colonel Brooke was promoted to his present grade and assumed his current assignment in January 1989.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States win back the confidence, respect, and admiration of the American people. The dramatic and overdue change in our national attitude has been a direct result of the dedication, determination, professionalism, and ability of men like Col. George M. Brooke III. On behalf of the grateful people of the Fourth Congressional District, I extend a heartfelt thank you to Colonel Brooke for his faithful service and wish him, his wife, Jane, their daughter, Catherine, and their son, Mercer, all the best in the years ahead.

THE RETIREMENT OF ROBERT L.
FUNSETH, A DISTINGUISHED
PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, later this week, Robert L. Funseth, who has served since 1982 as Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Refugee Programs, will retire from Government service after 39 years. When he does retire, Bob Funseth will be leaving an extraordinary record of humanitarianism that will not soon be forgotten.

Bob Funseth, who has served as a U.S. foreign service officer in six continents around the world, has in recent years been in the forefront of U.S. efforts to assist the world's refugees, who now number more than 15 million.

Bob Funseth understands very well that a country of immigrants such as the United States has an essential role to play in promoting a substantial and significant international commitment to protection of first asylum and provision of durable solutions for refugees. And he has been tireless in his effort to ensure that refugee issues have remained a high priority for U.S. foreign policymakers.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, I have come to know Bob well in his role as principal United States negotiator with the Vietnamese Government on a range of humanitarian issues. Bob was relentless in his effort to encourage the Vietnamese authorities to release tens of thousands of political prisoners who were held in so-called reeducation camps after 1975, including former South Vietnamese civilian and military officials, writers, and religious figures.

He also negotiated an agreement with the Vietnamese providing for the emigration and resettlement of former reeducation camp detainees and their families, who may number 100,000 or more.

I should also mention Bob's special commitment to Vietnamese Amerasians—that is, the children of United States servicemen and Vietnamese women—who have been treated so shabbily in Vietnam. Through Bob's diligent negotiating efforts, thousands of Amerasians have been resettled in the United States, and it is expected that all of the Amerasians who wish to resettle in the United States will have done so by 1993.

Bob can be proud of the numerous awards and decorations he has received for his humanitarian work on behalf of the world's refugees, including the Distinguished Honor Award that was conferred upon him by Secretary of State James Baker in 1989. But I expect that the most gratifying reward for Bob is the satisfaction of knowing that as the direct result of his efforts, tens of thousands of persons fleeing persecution have been offered protection in countries of first asylum, and new lives in countries of resettlement, where they are free to exercise their human rights.

I wish Bob and his wife Marilyn the very best in the years to come, and hope that, even in retirement, he will continue to offer us his valuable advice on refugee issues.

ANTI-SEMITISM ON THE RISE IN
ARGENTINA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as Argentina prepares for its midterm election, incidents of anti-Semitism continue to shock the nation's Jewish community, the largest in Latin America. Indicative of this troubling trend, the Nazi party of Argentina will field candidates in the upcoming elections.

The Nationalist Workers Party, an openly anti-Semitic political organization which has just adopted the swastika as its official party symbol, has been working the slums on the outskirts of Buenos Aires to generate support for Nazi candidates. Alejandro Biondini, the Nazi party leader, claims a membership of 25,000 and predicts, "If we keep growing as we expect, I'll be running for president in 1995."

Meanwhile, a rash of anti-Semitic vandalism has rocked the Jewish community. Earlier this month, a bomb exploded at a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires. A synagogue in the north of Argentina was severely vandalized. Last week, two men were arrested and charged with destroying 110 tombstones in a Jewish cemetery. Two days after the arrests, the cemetery walls were covered with ominous slurs: "Let's fill this place," read one piece of graffiti.

Argentina and anti-Semitism are no strangers. The Nationalist Workers Party, founded by Biondini in 1990, is merely a new vehicle through which expressions of hatred and malice against Jews are voiced in Argentina. In

fact, anti-Semitism has a long history in that South American country. Paralleling anti-Semitic activities in European countries prior to the Second World War, so called patriotic leagues in Argentina warned of the Jewish "conspiracy" to dominate world trade and finance. Moreover, it is no secret that Argentina was a refuge for Nazi war criminals after the fall of the Third Reich.

Mr. Speaker, if we learned anything from the tragedy of the Holocaust, it is that we must focus our attention on hatemongers like Biondini and his cowardly ilk early in their budding careers. The virulent rhetoric and anti-Semitic violence emanating from Argentina is serious cause for concern. I urge my colleagues to keep a vigilant eye on the disturbing developments in Argentina.

ETHNIC VIOLENCE IN ROMANIA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have had the opportunity to see tremendous change in Eastern Europe over the last few years. Happily, some of the greatest changes have come in the area of freedom of expression. Unfortunately, in some cases this freedom has let loose ethnic intolerance long repressed and long ignored. Now, that intolerance must be recognized and remedied.

This week in Romania, thousands of people attacked and burned the homes of Gypsies—who call themselves Roma—in two villages near Bucharest. As in similar incidents which occurred earlier this year in Romania, it is not known exactly what sparked this conflagration. What is known is that this is part of a growing wave of village assaults on Roma communities.

From the Inquisition to the Holocaust, Roma have suffered humanity's worst abuses. They have been enslaved and targeted for genocide during the Holocaust. They have been alternately subjected to forced assimilation and to virtual apartheid. They have been compelled to submit to involuntary sterilization and have had their children seized from them. And yet they have survived.

It would be a tragedy if the Roma people, who have endured so much, were made to suffer even longer in a time that otherwise holds so much hope for so many. We must ensure that these people, their culture, and their heritage are not destroyed by hatred and violence.

I understand that the Romanian Interior Minister has promised to investigate these events. I urge his government to do so with all deliberate speed and to ensure that those responsible are held accountable in accordance with the CSCE standards for the rule of law and the protection of minorities to which the Romanian government has committed itself. This is an urgent matter, Mr. Speaker. Political prisoners can be set free and banned books published, but lost lives can never be restored.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARVIN KIVITZ

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Marvin Kivitz, Ph.D., president of Elwyn Inc., located in Delaware County. Dr. Kivitz plans to retire June 30, 1991, after serving as president of Elwyn since 1979.

Elwyn is the Nation's oldest and largest private provider of rehabilitation services for people with mental and physical disabilities. Dr. Kivitz was instrumental in the transformation of Elwyn from a residential institution to one of the Nation's leading special education and rehabilitation centers for the mentally handicapped.

Dr. Kivitz holds a masters degree in vocational counseling from Columbia University and a doctorate of clinical psychology from the University of Pennsylvania. In 1961, Dr. Kivitz began at Elwyn as a psychologist. He went on to become director of vocational training; director of education, training and rehabilitation; vice president for programs; executive director; and ultimately, president for the last 11 years.

Dr. Kivitz received the Individual Distinguished Service Career Award and the W.F. Faulkes Award of the National Rehabilitation Association for his unswerving commitment and contributions to the lives of the mentally retarded persons. In 1979, Dr. Kivitz was the recipient of the Mid-Atlantic Region National Rehabilitation Award for outstanding achievement in rehabilitation. The DELARC award for outstanding achievement for the handicapped was another of the many awards that Dr. Kivitz has received in his career.

Dr. Kivitz has also coauthored many professional articles and coedited several textbooks including "A History of Mental Retardation, Collected Papers and Habilitation of the Handicapped." He is also a consulting editor for the American Journal of Mental Retardation.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kivitz has dedicated a lifetime to improving the lives of mentally retarded persons. I can only hope that others will follow Dr. Kivitz's tireless efforts to help mankind. I wish the best of luck to him in all future endeavors.

WHEATON COLLEGE PRESIDENT, ALICE EMERSON, RESIGNS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I read of the announced resignation of Alice Emerson as president of Wheaton College with the traditional mixed emotions. I am happy for Tish who has certainly earned the right to a little bit more time to think and write, and I am happy that she will have an opportunity at the Mellon Foundation to study a series of issues that are important to liberal arts

colleges. But as a Member of Congress in which Wheaton College is situated, I am saddened by our loss for the district. Tish Emerson is an extraordinarily able, dedicated, and thoughtful educator. Wheaton College, the town of Norton, and Massachusetts have been the beneficiaries of her talent and concern. The opportunity to get to know her and become one of her friends was one of the nice side benefits of this job for me, and she has been during my congressional service an important source of counsel on a wide range of issues.

Typical of her concern for the community is the extent to which she has made the facilities of Wheaton College available to the people of my congressional district for forums and meetings when that was appropriate. Situated as it is in the middle of my current congressional district, Wheaton College offers an ideal setting for the kind of meetings that are an important part of our congressional service. On every occasion that we have had need for assistance, Tish Emerson and her staff at Wheaton have tendered it cheerfully and with a very impressive efficiency.

I look forward to continuing to learn from Tish Emerson as she now devotes her significant talents to the study of important educational issues.

A CELEBRATION OF JUNETEENTH

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join with me and the City of Richmond, California, in celebrating the spirit of freedom and dignity as embodied in Juneteenth. Commemorating the abolition of slavery, Juneteenth has grown to be a celebration of the rich history of achievement and pride in our Nation's black community, and a recognition of the valuable contribution of African-Americans to the fabric of our society.

In August 1963, 100 years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., stood on the steps of the memorial to that great President, and shared with the world a dream. A dream in which children would "not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." In many parts of this Nation, however, Dr. King's dream is not yet a reality.

Congress has before it today an opportunity to bring us closer to this reality in the form of a measure which would strengthen employment protections for women and minorities. The Civil Rights Act of 1991, of which I am a cosponsor, would reverse several Supreme Court decisions that narrowed equal employment laws, and would provide remedies for workplace discrimination. The United States has passed many milestones on the road to racial equality in the last several decades—the Voting Rights Act and Brown v. Board of Education are two such landmarks. I feel confident that Congress will rise to the occasion and that the Civil Rights Act of 1991 will soon be another milestone.

In recognition of this Juneteenth celebration, I reaffirm my personal commitment to the realization of Dr. King's dream and invite my colleagues to do the same.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF ROSE
TABBERT

HON. ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great appreciation that I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues the dedicated teaching of Rose Tabbert at Holy Name Elementary School in San Antonio, TX. Not only is Rose a remarkable educator in the State of Texas, but this year Rose celebrated her 25th anniversary of educating at the Holy Name School. I would like to join along with Holy Name School's faculty, students, parents, alumni, and friends in honoring Rose's strong dedication to education.

Rose has dedicated her entire teaching career to the Holy Name School, and her devotion to her pupils is a marvelous inspiration for her fellow educators. One of the most rewarding aspects of Rose's career is the chance she has had to teach new generations of students. Some of these students have even been children of Rose's former students. Rose has also instilled a love of learning among her students that has been a consistent attribute of Holy Name School.

Not only is she an outstanding role model for her students, but she has a sense of pride in the San Antonio community. The regard Rose has shown in so many positive ways for San Antonio and especially the youth in the community is an excellent expression of generosity.

This Friday is Teacher Appreciation Day at the Holy Name School; therefore, I would like to congratulate Rose Tabbert for 25 years of outstanding service to Holy Name School.

All of us from San Antonio appreciate Rose's accomplishments, and we offer her our best wishes for many more years of wonderful service.

A TRIBUTE TO ANNABELLE
GLASSER

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a community leader who has pledged her life's work to my home borough of Queens, NY.

Annabelle Glasser moved to Queens in 1966, and immediately began her service to that community. She joined the Queens Ethical Society as a volunteer executive secretary, and later became its president. While continuing in this capacity, she has also served as the district manager of Community Board 8 in Queens since 1981.

As district manager, Ms. Glasser has worked to improve the delivery of city services

to the people of Community Board 8. She has acted as their representative at New York's monthly borough cabinet meetings, and its bi-weekly district managers meeting. Her tireless work on the behalf of all New Yorkers has earned my deepest respect.

Unfortunately, Annabelle Glasser is retiring as acting district manager. Community Board 8 will lose a talented manager, and Queens will lose an effective spokesperson. However, Ms. Glasser will continue to fight for her ideals: the improvement of the quality of life in New York City. As a life-long resident of New York City, I thank her for her efforts.

A WARM WELCOME TO PRESIDENT
VASSILIOU OF THE REPUBLIC OF
CYPRUS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in welcoming to Washington the President of the Republic of Cyprus, George Vassiliou, who met with our committee today and shared his views with us on the future of Cyprus.

I salute President Vassiliou for his determined efforts to find a solution to the long-standing Cyprus problem. He has shown patience and flexibility in the U.N.-sponsored intercommunal talks concerning that divided island nation. He has gained international respect for his deep commitment to finding a peaceful solution to the Cyprus dilemma.

Since 1974, Cyprus has been tragically divided. Over 30,000 Turkish troops occupy the northern part of the island, and over 200,000 Greek Cypriots became refugees in their own land after the Turkish invasion. Instead of encouraging the Turkish Cypriot leader, Rauf Denkash, to seriously engage in the intercommunal talks, the Turkish Government rewarded Mr. Denkash for his intransigence at the peace talks.

Ankara sent 60,000 Turkish settlers to Cyprus, recognized the so-called Turkish Cypriot entity in the north of the island, and provided significant financial assistance to Mr. Denkash's breakaway state. Turkey has also refused to withdraw its well-armed soldiers from the island and, in so doing, has turned its back on what would be a prudent confidence building gesture. I am convinced that the key to peace on Cyprus is in Ankara. We must encourage the United Nations to do even more in the peace process and also urge Turkey to become truly involved in bringing peace to that island.

While the administration deserves our praise for its masterful efforts in mobilizing international support at the United Nations during the recent gulf crisis, I would like to see similar efforts undertaken by President Bush to bring peace to Cyprus. As we build the new world order, Cyprus remains an unsolved problem that has defied international peace initiatives for 17 years. Now there is a window of opportunity and we must seize the moment. While we all know that President Bush and Secretary of State Baker are committed to

solving the Cyprus problem, I strongly encourage the administration to do more about that unresolved dispute and exert pressure on President Ozal of Turkey, if that will bring peace to Cyprus.

A solution to the Cyprus dispute would bring international praise to the Bush administration and would serve to reduce tensions between Greece and Turkey two of our key NATO allies. Justice would be realized on that divided island and the family of man would see the resolution of a problem through diplomacy, not the barrel of a gun.

Let us hope that the promises of the new world order will bring a resolution of the Cyprus problem. Again, a warm welcome to the President of Cyprus.

A TRIBUTE TO FRED SCHWENGEL

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Fred Schwengel, president of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society as he celebrates his 85th birthday. The life and work of Fred Schwengel have changed and enhanced the Capitol of the United States for decades.

Born in rural Franklin County, IA, to German immigrants, Fred's father praised the freedom and opportunity of his new country, but education was not a priority. Young Fred completed the eighth grade education offered by his school, but was determined to get an advanced degree.

His athletic ability won him a scholarship to Northeast Missouri Teachers College where he was named a small-college all-American in his senior year, and received the education he longed for.

After graduation, Schwengel got involved in local legislative affairs. As a result, he was elected president of the Young Republicans and State president of Iowa's junior chamber of commerce. In 1944 Fred ran for the Iowa Legislature, and won by a scant 34 votes.

While in the Iowa State Legislature, he was embroiled in one of the biggest controversies to face the State. He rallied behind a bill that required State aid to education. The passage of this bill left a lasting legacy in Iowa education. Prior to his efforts, the State provided no financial assistance, and consequently the school system was not meeting the needs of its student body.

Elected to Congress in 1954, Schwengel made many contributions. Of his 16 years in the House of Representatives, he will always be remembered as taking the lead to develop the Interstate Highway System, and convincing President Eisenhower to support the gas tax, which went into the trust fund, rather than taxing future generations with highway bonds.

Upon leaving the House, Fred brought the two great passions of his life—education and the U.S. Congress—together. Always trying to learn more about the Capitol in which he served, he organized the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, which became his lifework. With his vision, the Capitol Society has become the leading authority on the Nation's Capitol. The

funds collected by the society through contributions and the sale of books, slides, postcards, and other mementos, has been given back to the Capitol Building itself through the funding of art, restoration of old art, and research. The Capitol Society's most notable accomplishment has been the murals exhibited on the House side of the Capitol.

STATEMENT OF CONGRATULATIONS TO ELIZABETH CLEMENT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, one of my constituents, and the daughter of one of our most distinguished colleagues, won her first race for political office.

Elizabeth Clement, the daughter of Tennessee's Fifth District Representative Bob Clement, was elected vice president of the student body of Wayneswood Elementary School in Alexandria, VA.

I congratulate Elizabeth. She showed great determination and political acumen in winning the race. But the results were no surprise to those who know her father. She, thus continues the long Clement tradition of public service. She also continues the Clement tradition of winning every elective office sought.

The future bodes well for Elizabeth and her classmates. She will most assuredly serve the Wayneswood student body with great distinction.

FORTY YEARS AT THE COMPANY STORE

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Art Schiltz is retiring from the Procter & Gamble Co., July 1 after 40 years of loyal, dedicated, and productive service both at home and abroad. He is respected by his family and peers, admired by his coworkers, appreciated by his church and community, and loved by his family and friends, who are legion.

Born November 3, 1929, to Peter Joseph and Claudia Antoinette Schiltz of Chicago, IL, Art Schiltz began his professional accomplishments with Procter & Gamble following his graduation from Northwestern University in 1951. With a wife, 1-year-old daughter, Cathy, and 10-day-old son, David, in tow, Art reported to P&G's buying department May 21, 1951.

During his first 7 years with the company, he served as a buying trace clerk, FS&E adjuster, equipment expeditor, packaging buyer, and chemical buyer before being placed on special assignment. In 1959, Art Schiltz became a section manager, a position he maintained until being transferred to the overseas division for eventual assignment in Manila, Republic of the Philippines for 8 years.

Upon his return to the United States in 1969, Art was named manager of the

packaged products distribution division, the associate director and later manager of the traffic division. In 1983 he was returned to special assignment, this time in the corporate purchases department. He subsequently was made division manager of the current expense division of that department and later director. He currently holds, and will retire with, the title director, product-supply purchases.

During this time, Art has been active in his church, serving as a deacon and elder of the Kennedy Heights Presbyterian Church, active in and with the YMCA, and a host of other civic and community organizations and charities, a member of the Northwestern University College of Business alumni governing board, and a member of the Republican Party's "Who's Who."

I am honored and delighted to join Art's wife, Evelyn Stewart Schiltz, his children, and family members Cathy Lancaster and David Schiltz of Austin, TX, Connie Fryman, Barbara Read, Kathy Heinz and Tom Stewart of Cincinnati, OH, and Bonnie Brantley of Danville, KY, his seven grandchildren, Joe and Dan Lancaster, Alexis Read, Ethan and Tyson Heinz, and Christopher and Elizabeth Brantley, his sons-in-law David Lancaster, Roddy Read, and J.P. Brantley, the entire Procter & Gamble family of officers, directors, employees, and shareholders, and the host of other friends that this generous, energetic, productive man has earned along life's way as he has given of himself professionally and personally, in marking the occasion of his retirement celebration May 31, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schiltz is the father-in-law of one of my nephews, so I know first hand of his many accomplishments. I salute his service.

TRIBUTE TO MR. GEORGE R. CLARK

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1991

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. George R. Clark of Union, NJ, who was honored as the 1991 Citizen of the Year by the Michael A. Kelly Post 2433, Veterans of Foreign Wars of Union. Mr. Clark was honored on May 5, 1991. This prestigious award was given to Mr. Clark for his many years of service and dedication to the Township of Union and its people. At the award ceremony, he was also given a key to the city which was presented to him by Mayor Anthony Russo.

George Clark in his work and in his life might well be the finest example of model citizenry. In retrospect, his life's work demonstrates time and time again his commitment to this fellow citizens.

He served in the U.S. Navy for 5 years. He was stationed in the Pacific theatre during WWII on the U.S.S. *Frazier* which saw heavy combat action against Japanese submarines. He was later transferred to *Bon Homme Richard*, an attack carrier and finally to the 19th Fleet. In 1947, he was discharged after 5 years of honorable service. He returned to

Union upon his discharge where as a civilian he continued to serve in an exemplary way.

In 1951, George Clark joined the Union Fire Department. After only 5 years of service, he was promoted to Captain. Ten years later he earned his second promotion to deputy chief, a title which he held until he was elevated to acting chief in 1980. He retired from the Union Fire Department in 1985.

He remains very active in a number of youth organizations. His many years of volunteer work with PAL, an area boy's and girl's club reflects his concern for the physical and mental development of young people. He has also served as president and chairman of PAL. He is still a member of the board of directors. He was also cubmaster and webelo leader to the scouts of Cub Scout Pack 169 of St. Michael's Church and scoutmaster for Troop 69, also of St. Michael's. He received the Bronze Pelican Medallion from Archbishop Theodore McCarrick for his work with the scouts.

George Clark has spent his life working with people on all levels, from serving his country in the Navy to serving his community as a firefighter and humanitarian. George Clark represents what one person can bring to a community and that is a feeling of pride and accomplishment.

I am pleased to commend my friend, George Clark, for his work in the community and with the young people of Union, and I sincerely hope that there will be others who will follow his model example.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 30, 1991, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 4

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Wendell P. Gardner, Jr., to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1992 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on Africa.

SD-138

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the impact of certain pesticides manufactured in the United States and exported to Third World countries.

SR-332

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1992 for activities of the Secretary of the Interior, and Members of Congress.

S-128, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 667, to provide support for and assist the development of tribal judicial systems.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Readiness, Sustainability and Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Defense Environmental Restoration Account and the service environmental compliance funds accounts.

SR-222

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1992 for foreign assistance.

SD-419

11:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine recycling programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-138

Armed Services

Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on ICBM modernization.

SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 106, to revise the Federal Power Act to prohibit the granting of a Federal license for a hydroelectric project unless the applicant complies with all substantive and procedural requirements of the affected State in which the project is located with respect to water acquisition and use.

SD-366

Foreign Relations
Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee
Closed briefing on Moscow Embassy construction plans.

S-116, Capitol

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of John Schrote, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Program, Budget and Administration, and Mike Hayden, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

SD-366

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To continue hearings to examine recycling programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Program.

SD-406

Finance

To resume hearings to examine the causes and effects of rising health care costs and the status of access to health insurance, focusing on efforts by insurers to restrain rising health care costs and ways to improve access to affordable health insurance coverage for employees of small businesses and their dependents.

SD-215

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on enforcement and administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

SD-342

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up pending legislation.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1992 for foreign assistance.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Soviet military.

SD-419

Judiciary

Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee

To resume hearings on overview of the Bankruptcy Code, focusing on cramdowns of residential real estate mortgages in Chapter 13 bankruptcies.

SD-226

JUNE 11

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Mineral Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 433, to provide for the disposition of certain minerals on Federal lands, and S. 785, to establish a Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to mining.

SD-366

JUNE 12

9:00 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 962, and S. 963, bills to confirm the jurisdictional authority of tribal governments in Indian country.

SR-485

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 775 and S. 23, to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain disabled veterans, sections 111 through 113 of S. 127, and related proposals with regard to radiation compensation, and proposed legislation providing for VA hospice care.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax bills, including S. 90, S. 150, S. 267, S. 284, S. 649, and S. 913.

SD-215

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings of enforcement of anti-dumping and countervailing duties.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Foreign Commerce and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine national tourism policy.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the Agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, with Annex, signed at Washington, June 1, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 101-22).

SD-419

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to examine efforts to combat fraud and abuse in the insurance industry.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To resume hearings on legislative proposals to strengthen crime control.

SD-226

JUNE 19

9:00 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the National Native American Advisory Commission.

SR-485

12878

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Soviet economy.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 933, to provide fair funds to consumers of natural gas who are found to have been overcharged.

SD-366

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to examine efforts to combat fraud and abuse in the insurance industry.

SD-342

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up pending calendar business.

SR-418

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 362, to provide Federal recognition of the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama.

SR-485

May 29, 1991

JULY 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs.

SR-253

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 20

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Navajo-Hopi relocation program.

SR-485